arXiv:1605.03638v1 [math.NT] 11 May 2016

Nonvanishing of geodesic periods over compact hyperbolic manifolds

Feng Su

Abstract. Let X be a compact hyperbolic manifold with dimension $d \geqslant 3$. In this paper we show that there are infinitely many nonvanishing geodesic periods defined over any compact n-dimensional ($n \geqslant 2$) geodesic cycle of X.

1 Introduction

Let X be a compact hyperbolic manifold with dimension $d \geqslant 3$ and volume form dx, $\{\phi_j\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $L^2(X, dx)$ such that each ϕ_j is a Laplace eigenfunction: $\Delta\,\phi_j = \lambda_j\,\phi_j$ where $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ and Δ stands for the Laplace operator of X determined by its hyperbolic metric. In the theory of automorphic forms, ϕ_j's are called (normalized) "Maass forms" (after H. Maass). The order of ϕ_j's are arranged such that λ_j's are nondecreasing as j grows. Let Y be a compact geodesic cycle of X with dimension $n \geqslant 2$ and hyperbolic measure dy (see Sect. 2.1), ψ be a normalized Maass form on Y with Laplace eigenvalue λ. Define the *geodesic period* (*period* for short) as

$$P_Y(\phi_j, \psi) := \int_Y \phi_j(y)\overline{\psi}(y)dy.$$

Such period fits into the general notion of automorphic period which has been playing a central role in the study of automorphic forms thanks to its close relations with automorphic representations and special L-values (see [**II**], [**Wa**], [**Zh**], etc.). With notations and restrictions as above, the main conclusion of this paper is

Theorem 1. *For any fixed ψ, there are infinitely many j such that $P_Y(\phi_j, \psi) \neq 0$.*

In literature the nonvanishing of (infinitely many) geodesic periods can follow from the asymptotics of these periods. See [**He**], [**G**], [**Ze**], [**P**], [**Ts**] and [**MW**]. In particular, [**Ts**] dealt with a class of arithmetic hyperbolic manifolds and the periods defined over the codimension-1 geodesic cycles; the case where X is an arbitrary compact Riemann surface was treated in [**MW**] which has inspired us to work on higher dimensional situation.

In the language of automorphic representations, Theorem 1 says that, under certain restrictions on Γ, there are infinitely many G_0-distinguished spherical automorphic representations where $G_0 \subset G = SO(1, d)$ is a closed subgroup which descends to Y (see Sect. 2.1).

The content of this paper is organized as follows. In the next section we shall make some preparations on the necessary knowledge on hyperbolic space, representation theory and trace formula. These stuff will be used later. In Sect. 3 we shall insert a special test function into the trace formula and discuss the spectral side of the trace formula. The analysis of the geometric side will be given in Sect. 4 where we split this side into two parts: the main and error terms; in particular, the contributions from these two terms will be estimated. Theorem 1 then follows from the comparison of the spectral and geometric sides. The necessary conditions that the test function should fulfill (so that we can apply the trace formula) will be checked in Sect. 5.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Hyperbolic spaces

By the uniformization theorem, any d-dimensional orientable hyperbolic manifold X with finite volume can be realized as a locally symmetric space: $X \cong \Gamma\backslash G/K$ where G is the Lorentz group $SO(1,d)$, $\Gamma \cong \pi_1(X)$ is a torsion-free lattice of G and $K \cong SO(d)$ is a maximal compact subgroup of G. Without loss of generality we assume that $K = \{\mathrm{diag}(1,k) \,|\, k \in SO(d)\}$. The quotient space G/K is isomorphic to the hyperboloid model

$$\mathbb{H}^d = \Big\{ x = (x_0, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \,\Big|\, x_0^2 - \sum_{i\neq 0} x_i^2 = 1,\ x_0 > 0 \Big\}.$$

Let Y be a compact geodesic cycle of X with dimension n and hyperbolic measure dy. Then, up to finite cover, Y is isomorphic to $\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0$ where

$$G_0 = \{\mathrm{diag}(\tau_1,\, \tau_2) \in G \,|\, \tau_1 \in O(1,\, n),\ \tau_2 \in O(d-n)\}\,,$$

$$K_0 = \{\mathrm{diag}(\rho_1,\, \rho_2) \in K \,|\, \rho_1 \in O(n),\ \rho_2 \in O(d-n)\}$$

is the maximal compact subgroup of G_0, and $\Gamma_0 \cong \pi_1(Y)$ is a torsion-free uniform lattice of G_0.

An automorphic representation π of G is called G_0-distinguished if there exists $\phi \in \pi$ such that $\int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0} \phi(x)dx \neq 0$. The notion of "distinguished representation" is used in the setting of groups over adeles. Nevertheless, we adopt this notion since this paper applies to (uniform) real arithmetic lattices. In this prospect, Theorem 1 can be rephrased as follows: there are infinitely many (spherical) automorphic representations which are G_0-distinguished, provided that Γ is uniform.

2.2 Representation theory

Let Θ be the Cartan involution on G: $\Theta(g) = \left(g^T\right)^{-1}$ (transpose inverse). The Cartan involution θ on Lie algebra level (i.e., $\theta(X) = -X^T$) gives rise to the vector space decomposition of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G: $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{p} \oplus \mathfrak{k}$ where $\mathfrak{k} = \{X \in \mathfrak{g} \,|\, \theta(X) = X\}$ is a sub-Lie algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{p} = \{X \in \mathfrak{g} \,|\, \theta(X) = -X\}$. Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be a maximal abelian subspace of $\mathfrak{p}$. For each linear functional α on $\mathfrak{a}$, define $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha = \{X \in \mathfrak{g} \,|\, [H, X] = \alpha(H)X \text{ for all } H \in \mathfrak{a}\}$. The set of those nonzero α such that $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha \neq 0$ is a root system, denoted as $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{a})$. Let $E_{ij} = (e_{ij})$ be a $(d+1)\times(d+1)$ matrix whose entries satisfy: $e_{lk} = 1$ for $(l,k) = (i,j)$, $e_{ik} = 0$ otherwise. We choose $\mathfrak{a} = \mathbb{R}\,E$ where $E = E_{12} + E_{21}$. Then the root system $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{a})$ consists of two elements $\pm\alpha_0$ where α_0 (the positive root) is defined by $\mathrm{ad}(E)$. Let $E_i = E_{1,2+i} + E_{2,2+i} + E_{2+i,1} - E_{2+i,2}$ $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant d-1)$, then $\mathrm{ad}(E)E_i = E_i$ for each i. Hence, $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_0} = \mathfrak{n} := \mathbb{R}E_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{R}E_{d-1}$. Define the groups A, N, A^+ to be $A = \exp(\mathfrak{a})$, $N = \exp(\mathfrak{n})$, $A^+ = \exp(\mathbb{R}_+ E) \subset A$ where $\mathbb{R}_+$ means the set of positive real numbers. We have the Iwasawa decomposition $G = NAK$ and KAK-decomposition $G = KA^+K$ both of which are unique (note that we have restricted the middle component $A(g)$ of g in the KAK-decomposition to lie in A^+).

Denote

$$a_x^+ = \exp(xE), \qquad n_u = \exp\left(\sum_{i=1}^{d-1} u_i E_i\right)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $u = (u_1, \cdots, u_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. It is easy to verify that

$$a_x^+ = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh x & \sinh x & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \sinh x & \cosh x & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$n_u = \begin{pmatrix} 1+\frac{|u|^2}{2} & -\frac{|u|^2}{2} & u_1 & u_2 & \cdots & u_{d-1} \\ \frac{|u|^2}{2} & 1-\frac{|u|^2}{2} & u_1 & u_2 & \cdots & u_{d-1} \\ u_1 & -u_1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ u_2 & -u_2 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ u_{d-1} & -u_{d-1} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $|u|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} u_i^2$.

The Killing form $B(X,Y) = \mathrm{Tr}\big(\mathrm{ad}(X)\mathrm{ad}(Y)\big)$ on $\mathfrak{g}$, when restricted to $\mathfrak{p}$, induces a G-invariant Riemannian metric on G/K with which we have the distance between the two points $g{\cdot}o$, $e{\cdot}o$ on G/K:

$$\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(g{\cdot}o, e{\cdot}o) = B\big(\log A(g), \log A(g)\big)^{1/2} =: \|g\|.$$

This invariant Riemannian metric on G/K induces the metric and measure (denoted as μ') on $\Gamma\backslash G/K$. Let dk be a Haar measure of K. Throughout the paper we always assume that $\mathrm{vol}(K) = \int_K dk = 1$. Any Haar measure of G projects to a Radon measure μ of $\Gamma\backslash G$ and the latter, up to a positive scalar, projects to the measure μ' on $\Gamma\backslash G/K$ such that the quotient integral formula holds: $\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} f(x)\mu(x) = \int_{\Gamma\backslash G/K} f(xk)\mu'(x)dk$ for any $f \in C_c(\Gamma\backslash G)$.

The group G acts on $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G, \mu)$ via the right regular translation R_1: $R_1(f)(x) = f(xg)$ for $f \in L^2(\Gamma\backslash G, \mu)$, $x \in \Gamma\backslash G$. The Casimir operator $\Box$ acts on the dense subset of smooth functions of $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G,\, \mu)$ as a symmetric operator, and it has a unique self-adjoint extension to $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G,\, \mu)$; the similar conclusion holds for Δ and $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G/K,\, \mu')$ (see [**Ch**]). Any element in $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G/K, \mu')$ can be viewed as an element in $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G, \mu)$ that is K-invariant under the action R_1. When restricted to $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)^K$, the two operators $\Box$ and Δ are identical with each other.

Assume that Γ is uniform. Then R_1 is decomposed into irreducible representations (see Theorem 9.2.2 of [**DE**]):

$$R_1 \cong \bigoplus_{\pi \in \widehat{G}} N_\Gamma(\pi)\, \pi \tag{1}$$

where $\widehat{G}$ denotes the unitary dual of G, i.e., the set of equivalent classes of unitary irreducible representations of G, $N_\Gamma(\pi) < \infty$ denotes the multiplicity of π. Hence

$$L^2(\Gamma\backslash G/K) \cong \bigoplus_{\pi \in \widehat{G}^K} N_\Gamma(\pi)\, V_\pi^K \tag{2}$$

where $\widehat{G}^K$ means the subset of $\widehat{G}$ whose element π satisfies the condition $V_\pi^K \neq \{0\}$. Such π's are called *spherical* or *class one* representations. Here we use V_π to denote the representation space of π. Let $M \subset K$ denote the centralizer of A in K. Then $M = \{\mathrm{diag}(1, 1, k) \,|\, k \in SO(d-1)\}$. As $\mathfrak{a}$ is of dimension one, we can identify $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$ with $\mathbb{C}$ via the map $\iota : \mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^* \to \mathbb{C}$, $\alpha \mapsto \frac{d-1}{2}\alpha(E)$. Let ρ be the half sum of positive roots of the root system $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{a})$, then $\iota(\rho) = \frac{d-1}{2}$. From now on we shall not distinguish $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$ and $\mathbb{C}$. It is known that any nontrivial irreducible spherical representation of G is equivalent to $I(\nu) = \mathrm{Ind}_{MAN}^G(\mathbf{1} \otimes e^\nu \otimes \mathbf{1})$ for some $\nu \in (-\rho, \rho) \cup i\,\mathbb{R}$, and $I(\nu) \cong I(-\nu)$ for such ν. The trivial representation is isomorphic to the Langlands quotient of $I(\rho)$ modulo its unique subrepresentation. Let $\nu \in \mathfrak{a}_{\mathbb{C}}^*$ and (σ, V_σ) be a representation of M. Recall that

$$\mathrm{Ind}_{MAN}^G(\sigma \otimes e^\nu \otimes \mathbf{1}) = \left\{ h : G \to V_\sigma \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{c} h(mang) = e^{(\nu+\rho)\log a}\sigma(m)h(g) \text{ for} \\ man \in MAN,\ g \in G;\ h|_K \in L^2(K,\, V_\sigma) \end{array} \right\}$$

endowed with the action R_2 of G:

$$R_2(g)h(x) = h\,(xg)\,.$$

Let $\{\phi_j\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G/K, \mu')$ such that each ϕ_j is a Maass form with Laplace eigenvalue $\lambda_j = \rho^2 - \nu_j^2$. Denote by $\tilde{\phi}_i \in L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$ the natural lift of ϕ_j such that $\tilde{\phi}_i(xk) = \phi_j(x{\cdot}o)$ for

any $x \in \Gamma\backslash G$, $k \in K$. Under the action R_1 of G, $\tilde{\phi}_i$ generates an irreducible unitary subrepresentation $V_{\lambda_j} \subset L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$ of G. We have $V_{\lambda_j} \cong I(\nu_j)$.

Let $G_0 = M_0A_0N_0K_0$ be the Langlands decomposition of the group G_0 where $M_0 = M \cap G_0$, $A_0 = A \cap G_0 = A$, $N_0 = N \cap G_0$. Let $\mathfrak{n}_0$ be the Lie algebra of N_0. The half sum of positive roots of the system $(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{a}_0)$ is $\rho_0 = \frac{n-1}{2}$. Identifying $\mathfrak{p}_0 = \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{n}_0$ with the tangent space of G_0/K_0 at $e{\cdot}o$, any geodesic on G_0/K_0 can be translated by certain $g \in G$ (via the left multiplication) to be a new geodesic which passes through $e{\cdot}o$ and is written as $\{\exp(tX) \,|\, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ with proper $X \in \mathfrak{p}_0$ (direction of the geodesic). By Proposition 5.13 of [**Kn**]:

$$\mathfrak{p}_0 = \bigcup_{k \in K_0} \mathrm{Ad}(k)\mathfrak{a},$$

there exists $k \in K_0$ such that $\mathrm{Ad}(k)X \in \mathfrak{a}$. Taking proper conjugation if necessary, we may assume that there exists a closed geodesic C_0 on $\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0$ which can be written as $C_0 = \{\exp(tX){\cdot}o \,|\, t \in [0,1]\}$ with some $X \in \mathfrak{a}$, or equivalently, $C_0 = \Gamma_{00}\backslash A{\cdot}o$ where $\Gamma_{00} = \Gamma \cap AM_0 = \Gamma \cap AM$ (the second identity holds since Γ is torsion-free).

2.3 Hyperbolic distance

By Iwasawa decomposition, the subgroup $NA \subset G$ is topologically isomorphic to $\mathbb{H}^d \cong G/K$. We realize this isomorphisim as

$$S : N \times A \to \mathbb{H}^d, \quad (n,\, a) \mapsto S(na) = na \cdot \xi_0$$

where $\xi_0 = (1, 0, \cdots, 0) \in \mathbb{H}^d$. For $r > 0$, define $a_r := a^+_{\log r} = \exp(\log r\, E)$. There is a one-to-one correspondence between $\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ and NA:

$$T : \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \to NA, \quad (u, r) \mapsto n_u a_r.$$

Let $x = (u,\, r)$, $y = (v,\, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+$. The hyperbolic distance between two points $a = S \circ T(x)$, $b = S \circ T(y)$ on $\mathbb{H}^d$ is

$$\mathrm{d}_{\mathbb{H}^d}(a,\, b) = \mathrm{arccosh}^+ \left[\frac{|u - v|^2 + r^2 + t^2}{2rt} \right]. \tag{3}$$

Here we use $^+$ to denote the nonnegative branch of the double valued function arccosh. The relation between $\mathrm{d}_{\mathbb{H}^d}(\cdot,\, \cdot)$ and $\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(\cdot,\, \cdot)$ is given by

$$\mathrm{d}_{\mathbb{H}^d}(a, b) = \mathrm{d}_{G/K}\big(T(x){\cdot}o, T(y){\cdot}o\big) = \big\|T(y)^{-1} \cdot T(x)\big\|. \tag{4}$$

For this fact, see Proposition I.7.3 and I.7.5 of [**FJ**].

2.4 Trace formula

Let U be a subset of G, f be a continuous function on G. Define

$$f_U : G \to \mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}, \quad g \mapsto \sup_{x,\, y \in U} \big|f(xgy)\big|.$$

We say f is *uniformly integrable* if there exists some compact neighborhood U of the unity e such that f_U lies in $L^1(G)$. Denote by $C_{\mathrm{unif}}(G)$ the set of all continuous uniformly integrable functions over G. Given $f \in C_{\mathrm{unif}}(G)$, define

$$(R_1(f)\phi)(x) = \int_G f(g) R_1(g)\phi(x) dg$$

for $\phi \in L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$. Then $R_1(f)$ is an integral operator by

Lemma 1.

$$(R_1(f)\phi)(x) = \int_{\Gamma\backslash G} K_f(x,\, y)\phi(y)\mu(y),$$

where $K_f(x,\, y) = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} f(x^{-1}\gamma y)$ *is continuous on* $\Gamma\backslash G \times \Gamma\backslash G$.

For details about $C_{\mathrm{unif}}(G)$ and the proof of this lemma, see Sect. 9.2 of [**DE**]. The assumption in the reference, that H is uniform, is necessary for the decomposition (1), but not for this lemma.

Let f be a bi-K-invariant function in $C_{\mathrm{unif}}(G)$. Then $R_1(f)$ acts on $V_{\lambda_j}^K \subset L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)^K$ with the integral kernel K_f since $R_1(f)\phi$ is still K-invariant for any $\phi \in V_{\lambda_j}^K$. The space $I(\nu_j)^K$ is one-dimensional: any K-fixed function in $I(\nu_j)$ is determined by its values at the points in $P = MAN$ thanks to the Langlands decomposition $G = MANK$ and the the transformation law in $I(\nu_j)$. Consequently, $V_{\lambda_j}^K = \mathbb{C}\,\phi$ and there exists a scalar $h_f(\nu_j)$ such that $R_1(f)\phi = h_f(\nu_j)\phi$. In view of the bi-$K$-invariance of f and the definition of K_f, we may identify $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)^K$ with $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G/K)$, and regard $K_f(x,\, y)$ as a function over $\Gamma\backslash G/K \times \Gamma\backslash G/K$. Then $R_1(f)$ induces the action of f on $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G/K)$. Likewise, $R_2(f)$ acts on $I(\nu_j)$:

$$(R_2(f)h)(x) = \int_G f(g)R_2(g)h(x)dg, \quad h \in I(\nu_j)$$

with integral kernel K_f as above. Furthermore, we have $R_2(f)\eta = h_f(\nu_j)\eta$ for any nontrivial element η in $I(\nu_j)^K$.

To compute $h_f(\nu_j)$, we use the model $I(\nu_j)$ and the action $R_2(f)$. Let $\eta_{\nu_j} \in I(\nu_j)^K$ be a complex-valued function over G defined as $\eta_{\nu_j}(mank) = e^{(\nu_j+\rho)\log a}$. Since $\eta_{\nu_j}(1) = 1$, it follows that

$$(R_2(f)\eta_{\nu_j})(1) = h_f(\nu_j)\,\eta_{\nu_j}(1) = h_f(\nu_j).$$

By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}(R_2(f)\eta_{\nu_j})(1) &= \int_G f(g)\eta_{\nu_j}(g)\,dg \\ &\overset{(a)}{=} \int_A\int_N\int_K f(ank)\,\eta_{\nu_j}(ank)dadndk \\ &= \int_N\int_A f(an)\,e^{(\nu_j+\rho)\log a}dadn \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

In the step (a) we have used the integral formula of functions on G where the variable is written in the ANK-order (see Corollary 5.3 of [**H**]). Now we choose the Haar measures on A and N. Let $a = e^X$, $n = e^Y$ for $X \in \mathfrak{a}$, $Y \in \mathfrak{n}$. Since A and N are abelian groups, $da := dX$, $dn = dY$ are Haar measures on A, N respectively, where dX, dY are Lebesgue measures on the Euclidean spaces $\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{n}$. Such choice of measures holds for any semisimple groups. The reason is that the group N is nilpotent, while Lebesgue measures on its Lie algebras induce Haar measures of N (see Theorem 2.1 of [**CG**]). To be more precise, we have: $\int_N f(n)dn = \int_{\mathfrak{n}} f(\exp Y)dY$ for any $f \in L^1(N, dn)$. Now (5) reads

$$h_f(\nu_j) = \int_{\mathfrak{n}}\int_{\mathfrak{a}} f\left(e^X \cdot e^Y\right) e^{\nu_j(X)+\rho(X)}dXdY. \tag{6}$$

We call $h_f(\nu_j)$ the *Harish-Chandra – Selberg transform* of f. The above formulation on $h_f(\nu_j)$ is due to Selberg [**Se**]. One can also use Harish-Chandra's theory on spherical functions to describe $h_f(\nu_j)$.

From now on we shall use $h_f(\lambda_j)$ instead of $h_f(\nu_j)$. This is reasonable: as ν_j is decided up to ± 1 for fixed λ_j, and $I(\nu_j) \cong I(-\nu_j)$ for $\nu_j \in (-\rho, \rho) \cup i\,\mathbb{R}$, so we have $h_f(\nu_j) = h_f(-\nu_j)$. Assume that $f \in C_{\mathrm{unif}}(G)$ is a bi-K-invariant function such that the series

$$k_f(z,\, w) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h_f(\lambda_j)\phi_j(z)\overline{\phi_j(w)}, \quad z,\, w \in \Gamma\backslash G/K$$

locally uniformly converge everywhere.

Proposition 1. *K_f being viewed as a function over $\Gamma\backslash G/K \times \Gamma\backslash G/K$, we have: $K_f = k_f$.*

Proof. By Lemma 1, $R_1(f)$ is an integral operator with continuous integral kernel K_f. Meanwhile $R_1(f)\phi_j = h_f(\lambda_j)\phi_j$. Define

$$T_k : L^2(\Gamma\backslash G/K) \to L^2(\Gamma\backslash G/K), \quad \phi \mapsto \int\limits_{\Gamma\backslash G/K} k_f(z,\, w)\phi(w)\mu'(w).$$

Then, by definition T_k is an integral operator such that $T_k(\phi_j) = h_f(\lambda_j)\,\phi_j$ as ϕ_j's are orthonormal to each other. Hence, T_k and $R(f)$ are identical to each other as operators and their integral kernels are equal to each other except on a possible subset of measure zero. The locally uniform convergence of k_f implies that k_f is a continuous function as all ϕ_j's are analytic over $\Gamma\backslash G/K$. It follows that $K_f = k_f$. □

By Lemma 1 and Proposition 1 one has

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} f(z^{-1}\gamma w) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h_f(\lambda_j)\phi_j(z)\overline{\phi_j(w)}, \quad z,\ w \in \Gamma\backslash G/K.$$

Let ψ be a normalized Maass form on $\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0$ with Laplace eigenvalues $\lambda = \rho_0^2 - \nu^2$ where $\nu \in (-\rho_0, \rho_0)\cup i\,\mathbb{R}$. Integrating both sides on $\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0\times\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0$ with respect to the measure $\psi(z)\overline{\psi(w)}dzdw$ gives the (relative) trace formula

$$\int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0}\int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0}\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} f(z^{-1}\gamma w)\psi(z)\overline{\psi(w)}dzdw = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h_f(\lambda_j)\, P_Y(\phi_j,\psi)\,\overline{P_Y(\phi_j,\psi)}. \tag{7}$$

The left (right) hand side of (7) is called *geometric* (resp. *spectral*) side. For this identity to hold, the *test function* f should satisfy: (1) $f \in C_{\mathrm{unif}}(G)$; (2) f is bi-K-invariant; (3) k_f is locally uniformly convergent. These conditions will be checked in Sect. 5 for a special f chosen in the next section.

3 The spectral side

In this section we choose a test function and apply it to the spectral side of (7). The bi-K-invariance of f indicates that $f(g)$ depends exactly on the hyperbolic distance between $g{\cdot}o$ and $e{\cdot}o$ (on G/K). Let $\Phi_\mu(x)$ be a smooth function over $\mathbb{R}_{\geqslant 0}$ for any $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Define the test function $f \in C^\infty(G)$ as $f(g) = \Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(g{\cdot}o,\, e{\cdot}o)\right)$. Like the case of G/K, the quotient $G_0/K_0 \cong \mathbb{H}^n$ can be parameterized by $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\mathbb{R}_+$ via the maps T, S (see Sect. 2.3). By (6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_f(\lambda_j) &= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} \Phi_\mu\Big(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}\left(a_x^+ n_u{\cdot}o,\, e{\cdot}o\right)\Big)\cdot e^{(\nu_j+\rho)x}dxdu \\ &= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}_+} \Phi_\mu\Big(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}\left(a_r n_u{\cdot}o,\, e{\cdot}o\right)\Big)\cdot r^{\nu_j+\rho-1}\,drdu \end{aligned}$$

where we have made the variable exchange $x \to \log r$ in the second step. By (3) and (4) we have

$$\mathrm{d}_{G/K}\left(a_r n_u{\cdot}o,\, e{\cdot}o\right) = \mathrm{d}_{G/K}\left(e{\cdot}o,\, n_{-u}a_{r^{-1}}{\cdot}o\right) = \operatorname{arccosh}^+\left(\frac{|ru|^2+1+r^2}{2r}\right),$$

noting that $e = n_0\, a_1$. Originally one would like to insert the heat kernel (see [GN]), but then it is difficult to deal with the geometric side. In this paper the test function is chosen to be

$$\Phi_\mu(x) = \exp(-\mu\cdot\cosh x).$$

It follows that

$$h_f(\lambda_j) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}_+} \exp\left[-\mu\left(\frac{|u|^2+1}{2}r + \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{r}\right)\right] r^{\nu_j+\rho-1} dr du. \tag{8}$$

The following two integral formulas on K-Bessel functions are useful to us:

$$\int\limits_0^\infty x^{\nu-1} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha}{x} - \beta x\right) dx = 2\left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{\nu}{2}} K_\nu\left(2\sqrt{\alpha\beta}\right), \quad \mathrm{Re}(\alpha) > 0,\ \mathrm{Re}(\beta) > 0. \tag{9}$$

$$\int\limits_0^\infty \left(x^2+b^2\right)^{\mp\frac{\nu}{2}} K_\nu\left(a\sqrt{x^2+b^2}\right)\cos(cx)dx = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} a^{\mp\nu} b^{\frac{1}{2}\mp\nu} \left(a^2+c^2\right)^{\pm\frac{\nu}{2}-\frac{1}{4}} K_{\pm\nu-\frac{1}{2}}\left(b\sqrt{a^2+c^2}\right) \tag{10}$$

where $\mathrm{Re}(a) > 0$, $\mathrm{Re}(b) > 0$, c is a real number. These are the formulas 3.471.9 and 6.726.4 of [**GR**] respectively.

Let $\alpha = \frac{\mu}{2}$, $\beta = \frac{|u|^2+1}{2}\mu$, $\nu = \nu_j + \rho$ in the formula (9), then the integration along r in (8) gives

$$h_f(\lambda_j) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} 2\left(|u|^2+1\right)^{-\frac{\nu_j+\rho}{2}} K_{\nu_j+\rho}\left(\mu\sqrt{|u|^2+1}\right) du$$

Let $x = u_1$, $b^2 = u_2^2 + \cdots + u_{d-1}^2 + 1$, $a = \mu$, $c = 0$, $\nu = \nu_j + \rho$ in the (first case of) formula (10), then the integration along u_1 in the above integral is equal to

$$2^d \int\limits_0^\infty \cdots \int\limits_0^\infty \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}} \left(\sqrt{u_2^2+\cdots+u_{d-1}^2+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}-(\nu_j+\rho)} K_{\nu_j+\rho-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\mu\sqrt{u_2^2+\cdots+u_{d-1}^2+1}\right) du_2 \cdots du_{d-1} \tag{11}$$

Let $x = u_2$, $b^2 = u_3^2 + \cdots + u_{d-1}^2 + 1$, $a = \mu$, $c = 0$, $\nu = \nu_j + \rho - \frac{1}{2}$ in the formula (10), then the integration along u_2 in the above integral gives

$$(11) = 2^d \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^2 \int\limits_0^\infty \cdots \int\limits_0^\infty \left(\sqrt{u_3^2+\cdots+u_{d-1}^2+1}\right)^{1-(\nu_j+\rho)} K_{\nu_j+\rho-1}\left(\mu\sqrt{u_3^2+\cdots+u_{d-1}^2+1}\right) du_3 \cdots du_{d-1}$$

Repeating this process, i.e., doing integrations along u_3, u_4, …, u_{d-1} step by step in the above fashion, we finally get

$$h_f(\lambda_j) = 2^d \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^{d-1} K_{\nu_j+\rho-\frac{d-1}{2}}(\mu) = 2^d \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^{d-1} K_{\nu_j}(\mu).$$

Now the spectral side of (7) reads:

$$\sum_{j=0}^\infty 2^d \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^{d-1} K_{\nu_j}(\mu) \left|P_Y(\phi_j, \psi)\right|^2.$$

4 The geometric side

Under our choice of f the geometric side of (7) splits as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0} \int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0} \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma} f(z^{-1}\gamma w)\psi(z)\overline{\psi(w)} dz dw \\
= &\int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0} \int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0} \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_0} \Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(\gamma w,\, z)\right) \psi(z)\overline{\psi(w)} dz dw \\
&+ \mathcal{O}\left(\int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0} \int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0} \sum_{\gamma_1,\,\gamma_2\in\Gamma_0} \sum_{\tilde{\gamma}\in\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0\smallsetminus\{\tilde{1}\}} \Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}\left(\gamma\gamma_1 w,\, \gamma_2 z\right)\right) \psi(z)\overline{\psi(w)} dz dw\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \int_{G_0/K_0}\int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0} \Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(w,z)\right)\psi(z)\overline{\psi(w)}dzdw$$
$$+\mathcal{O}\left(\int_{G_0/K_0}\int_{G_0/K_0}\sum_{\tilde{\gamma}\in\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0\smallsetminus\{\tilde{1}\}}\Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(\gamma w,z)\right)\psi(z)\overline{\psi(w)}dzdw\right)$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}$ denotes a nontrivial double coset in $\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0$. To simplify the notations, we still use dz, dw to denote the measure of space G_0/K_0. This is reasonable since the measure of G_0/K_0 descends to that of the quotient space $\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0$. It is not clear whether any element in $\Gamma\smallsetminus\Gamma_0$ can be written as $\gamma_1\gamma\gamma_2$ with unique γ_1, $\gamma_2\in\Gamma_0$ and some fixed representative element γ of a double coset class $\tilde{\gamma}\neq\tilde{1}$. So we have to use the expression $\mathcal{O}(\cdots)$ in the above formula. Denote

$$\Sigma_0=\int_{G_0/K_0}\int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0}\Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(w,z)\right)\psi(z)\overline{\psi(w)}dzdw$$

and

$$\Sigma_1=\int_{G_0/K_0}\int_{G_0/K_0}\sum_{\tilde{\gamma}\in\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0\smallsetminus\{\tilde{1}\}}\Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(\tilde{\gamma}w,z)\right)\psi(z)\overline{\psi(w)}dzdw.$$

In the next two sections we shall show that Σ_0 is the main term of the geometric side, while Σ_1 is the error term.

4.1 The main term

Like the case of $\phi\in L^2(\Gamma\backslash G/K)$, the Maass form ψ also gives rise to an irreducible unitary spherical representation $V'_\lambda\subset L^2(\Gamma_0\backslash G_0)$. Assume that $V'_\lambda\cong I'(\nu):=\mathrm{Ind}_{M_0AN_0}^{G_0}(\mathbf{1}\otimes e^\nu\otimes\mathbf{1})$. Here, to distinguish the representation of G_0 from that of G, we use V'_λ and $I'(\nu)$, instead of V_λ and $I(\nu)$. Normalize the Haar measure of K_0 such that $\mathrm{vol}(K_0)=1$. By the quotient integral formula, we can rewrite Σ_0 as

$$\Sigma_0=\int_{G_0}\int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0}\Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(g{\cdot}o,x{\cdot}o)\right)\tilde{\psi}(x)\overline{\tilde{\psi}(\bar{g})}dxdg$$

where $\tilde{\psi}$, as before, stands for the natural lift of ψ on $\Gamma_0\backslash G_0$, $\bar{g}$ denotes the element $\Gamma_0{\cdot}g\in\Gamma_0\backslash G_0$, dx the invariant Radon measure of $\Gamma_0\backslash G_0$, dg the Haar measure of G_0. In such formulation, Σ_0 defines a nonzero $(K_0\times K_0)$-invariant functional L_ν^{aut} over $V'_\lambda\times V'_\lambda$ where each $K_0\times K_0$ acts on $V'_\lambda\times V'_\lambda$ via $R_1\times R_1$ (the right regular translation):

$$L_\nu^{\mathrm{aut}}:\ V'_\lambda\times V'_\lambda\to\mathbb{C},\quad (h_1,h_2)\mapsto\int_{G_0}\int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0}\Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(g{\cdot}o,x{\cdot}o)\right)h_1(x)\overline{h_2(\bar{g})}dxdg.$$

This functional is $\mathbb{C}$-linear for its first entry and conjugate $\mathbb{C}$-linear for its second entry. For $z\in\Gamma_0\backslash G_0$, L_ν^{aut} is well-defined although $\mathrm{d}_{G/K}\left(w{\cdot}o,\,z{\cdot}o\right)$ is not. The space of $(K_0\times K_0)$-invariant functionals over $V'_\lambda\times V'_\lambda$ is one-dimensional. The reason is as follows. In view of the equivalence between V'_λ and $I'(\nu)$, it suffices to show that the space of K_0-invariant functional over $I'(\nu)$ is one dimensional, which is clearly true by the definition of $I'(\nu)$. As a consequence, there exists a nonzero scalar $a_\nu\in\mathbb{C}$ such that

$$L_\nu^{\mathrm{aut}}(h_1,h_2)=a_\nu\cdot L_\nu^{\mathrm{mod}}(f_1,f_2)$$

for any nonzero $(K_0\times K_0)$-invariant $(\mathbb{C}\times\overline{\mathbb{C}})$-linear functional L_ν^{mod} on $I'(\nu)\times I'(\nu)$ where $f_i\in I'(\nu)$ corresponds to $h_i\in V'_\lambda$. Define L_ν^{mod} to be

$$L_\nu^{\mathrm{mod}}(f_1,f_2)=\int_{G_0}\int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0}\Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(g{\cdot}o,x{\cdot}o)\right)f_1(x)\overline{f_2(g)}dzdg,\quad f_1,\ f_2\in I'(\nu).$$

Then $\Sigma_0=a_\nu\cdot L_\nu^{\mathrm{mod}}(\eta_\nu,\eta_\nu)$. See Sect. 2.4 for the definition of η_ν. Now we compute $L_\nu^{\mathrm{mod}}(\eta_\nu,\eta_\nu)$. For $g{\cdot}o=n_ua_s{\cdot}o\in G_0/K_0$ where $u\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $s\in\mathbb{R}_+$, equip G_0/K_0 with the hyperbolic measure $d(g{\cdot}o)=\frac{dsdu}{s^n}$.

Let $\mathcal{P}(Y)$ be the completion of a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\mathbb{R}_+$ that is isomorphic to $\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0$. Then $\mathcal{P}(Y)$ is compact. The following commutativity property will be used frequently in this paper:

$$a_r n_u = n_{ur} a_r. \tag{12}$$

One can verify (12) be a direct computation, or see Proposition I.4.2 of [**FJ**]. Actually (12) results from a simple fact in Lie algebra: $\mathrm{ad}(E)E_i = E_i$. As η_ν is K_0-invariant and $\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(w,z) = \mathrm{d}_{G_0/K_0}(w,z)$ for w, $z\in G_0/K_0$ (note that $G_0/K_0\subset G/K$ is totally geodesic), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
L_\nu^{\mathrm{mod}}(\eta_\nu,\eta_\nu) &= \int_{G_0/K_0}\int_{\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0} \Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G_0/K_0}(w,z)\right)\eta_\nu(z)\overline{\eta_\nu(w)}dzdw\\
&= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\mathbb{R}_+}\ \int\limits_{\mathcal{P}(Y)} \Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G_0/K_0}(n_u a_s\cdot o,\, n_v a_r\cdot o)\right) r^{\nu+\rho_0}\, s^{\bar\nu+\rho_0}\frac{drdv}{r^n}\frac{dsdu}{s^n}\\
&= \int\limits_{\mathcal{P}(Y)}\ \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\mathbb{R}_+} \exp\left(-\mu\cdot\frac{|u-v|^2+s^2+r^2}{2sr}\right) s^{\bar\nu+\rho_0}\frac{dsdu}{s^n}\cdot r^{\nu+\rho_0}\frac{drdv}{r^n}\\
&= \int\limits_{\mathcal{P}(Y)}\ \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\mathbb{R}_+} \exp\left[-\frac{\mu}{2}\left(\frac{\left|\frac{u-v}{r}\right|^2+1}{\frac{s}{r}}+\frac{s}{r}\right)\right] s^{\bar\nu+\rho_0}\frac{dsdu}{s^n}\cdot r^{\nu+\rho_0}\frac{drdv}{r^n}
\end{aligned}$$

Let $u' = \frac{u-v}{r}$, $s' = \frac{s}{r}$, then $du = r^{n-1}du'$ and

$$L_\nu^{\mathrm{mod}}(\eta_\nu,\eta_\nu) = \int\limits_{\mathcal{P}(Y)}\ \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\mathbb{R}_+} \exp\left[-\frac{\mu}{2}\left(\frac{|u'|^2+1}{s'}+s'\right)\right] s'^{(\bar\nu+\rho_0-n)}ds'du'\cdot r^{\bar\nu+\nu+2\rho_0-n}drdv.$$

The rest of the computation is merely a copy of that for $h_f(\lambda_j)$. Firstly, apply (9) to the integration over s', then the right hand side of the above identity is equal to

$$2\int\limits_{\mathcal{P}(Y)}\ \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(1+|u'|^2\right)^{\frac{\bar\nu+\rho_0-n+1}{2}} K_{\bar\nu+\rho_0-n+1}\left(\mu\sqrt{1+|u'|^2}\right)du'\cdot r^{2\mathrm{Re}(\nu)-1}drdv.$$

Secondly, apply the second case of (10) to the integration over u' step by step, then the above integral is equal to

$$2^n\left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^{n-1} K_{\bar\nu}(\mu)\int_{\mathcal{P}(Y)} r^{2\mathrm{Re}(\nu)-1}drdv.$$

The subset $\mathcal{P}(Y)$ is compact and $r>0$ for $(v,r)\in\mathcal{P}(Y)$. Hence, the integral

$$I_\nu := \int_{\mathcal{P}(Y)} r^{2\mathrm{Re}(\nu)-1}drdv$$

converges and does not vanish. Denote $b_\nu = 2^n a_\nu\, I_\nu \neq 0$. Up to now we have shown

$$\Sigma_0 = b_\nu\cdot\left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^{n-1} K_{\bar\nu}(\mu). \tag{13}$$

4.2 The error term

In this section we give a bound for Σ_1. The main conclusion is

$$\Sigma_1 \ll \mu^{-(n+2)/2}e^{-\mu}. \tag{14}$$

It turns out that the error term Σ_1 is more difficult to be treated than Σ_0. Like what we have done for Σ_0, we use the uniqueness of $(K_0\times K_0)$-invariant $(\mathbb{C}\times\overline{\mathbb{C}})$-linear functionals to reduce the computation of Σ_1 to that of special integrals. Define

$$\ell_\nu^{\mathrm{aut}}:\ V_\lambda'\times V_\lambda'\to\mathbb{C},\quad (h_1,h_2)\mapsto\int_{G_0}\int_{G_0}\sum_{\tilde\gamma\in\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0\smallsetminus\{\tilde 1\}}\Phi_\mu\big(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(\gamma g_1\cdot o, g_2\cdot o)\big)h_1(\bar g_1)\overline{h_2(\bar g_2)}dg_1dg_2$$

where $\bar{g}_i$ denotes the element $\Gamma_0 \cdot g_i \in \Gamma_0 \backslash G_0$. It is clear that ℓ_ν^{aut} is a nonzero $(K_0 \times K_0)$-invariant $(\mathbb{C} \times \overline{\mathbb{C}})$-linear functional on $V_\lambda' \times V_\lambda'$ and $\Sigma_1 = \ell_\nu^{\mathrm{aut}}\left(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\psi}\right)$. As before, the space of such functionals on is one-dimensional. Thus, for a given nonzero $(K_0 \times K_0)$-invariant $(\mathbb{C} \times \overline{\mathbb{C}})$-linear functional on $I'(\nu) \times I'(\nu)$ there exists a scalar $d_\nu \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\ell_\nu^{\mathrm{aut}} = d_\nu \cdot \ell_\nu^{\mathrm{mod}}$. Note that d_ν depends only on ν. Define

$$\ell_\nu^{\mathrm{mod}} : I'(\nu) \times I'(\nu) \to \mathbb{C}, \quad (f_1, f_2) \mapsto \int_{G_0} \int_{G_0} \sum_{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_0 \backslash \Gamma / \Gamma_0 \smallsetminus \{\tilde{1}\}} \Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(g_2 \cdot o, g_1 \cdot o)\right) f_1(g_1) \overline{f_2(g_2)} dg_1 dg_2.$$

Then ℓ_ν^{mod} is $(K_0 \times K_0)$-invariant $(\mathbb{C} \times \overline{\mathbb{C}})$-linear on $I'(\nu) \times I'(\nu)$ and $\Sigma_1 = d_\nu \cdot \ell_\nu^{\mathrm{mod}}(\eta_\nu, \eta_\nu)$ where η_ν is as before. Let $w = n_u\, a_r \cdot o$, $z = n_v\, a_t \cdot o \in G_0/K_0$ where u, $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and r, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. We have

$$\ell_\nu^{\mathrm{mod}}(\eta_\nu, \eta_\nu) = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \sum_{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_0 \backslash \Gamma / \Gamma_0 \smallsetminus \{\tilde{1}\}} \Phi_\mu\big(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(\gamma w, z)\big) t^{\nu+\rho_0} r^{\bar{\nu}+\rho_0} \frac{dtdv}{t^n} \frac{drdu}{r^n}.$$

Write $\gamma = a(\gamma)n(\gamma)k(\gamma) = a_{r_0}\, n_{w_0} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & u_0 \end{pmatrix} \in ANK$ where $w_0 = (w_{01}, \cdots, w_{0,d-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and $u_0 = (u_{ij}) \in SO_d$. Assume that $\gamma w = n_{v_1} a_{s_1} \cdot o$ where $v_1 = (v_{11}, \cdots, v_{1,d-1})$. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} J_\gamma &= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \Phi_\mu\big(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(\gamma w, z)\big) t^{\nu+\rho_0} r^{\bar{\nu}+\rho_0} \frac{dtdv}{t^n} \frac{drdu}{r^n} \\ &= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \exp\left(-\mu \cdot \frac{|v - v_1|^2 + s_1^2 + t^2}{2 s_1 t}\right) t^{\nu+\rho_0-n} r^{\bar{\nu}+\rho_0-n} dtdvdrdu \end{aligned}$$

We treat the integration along t by using (9) and get

$$\begin{aligned} J_\gamma &= 2 \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(|v - v_1|^2 + s_1^2\right)^{\frac{\nu+\rho_0-n+1}{2}} K_{\nu+\rho_0-n+1}\left(\mu \sqrt{\left|\frac{v - v_1}{s_1}\right|^2 + 1}\right) r^{\bar{\nu}+\rho_0-n} dvdrdu \\ &= 2 \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(\left|\frac{v - v_1}{s_1}\right|^2 + 1\right)^{\frac{\nu+\rho_0-n+1}{2}} K_{\nu+\rho_0-n+1}\left(\mu \sqrt{\left|\frac{v - v_1}{s_1}\right|^2 + 1}\right) d\left(\frac{v}{s_1}\right) s_1^{\nu+\rho_0} r^{\bar{\nu}+\rho_0-n} drdu \end{aligned}$$

The first $(n-1)$ entries in $\frac{v_1}{s_1}$ can be absorbed in to $\frac{v}{s_1}$ when we do the integration along $\frac{v}{s_1}$, leaving the last $(d-n)$ components of $\frac{v_1}{s_1}$. Denote $|x|_{\geqslant n}^2 = x_n^2 + \cdots + x_{d-1}^2$ for $x = (x_1, \cdots, x_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. Let $v' = \frac{v}{s_1}$, then

$$J_\gamma = 2 \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(|v'|^2 + \left|\frac{v_1}{s_1}\right|_{\geqslant n}^2 + 1\right)^{\frac{\nu+\rho_0-n+1}{2}} K_{\nu+\rho_0-n+1}\left(\mu \sqrt{|v'|^2 + \left|\frac{v_1}{s_1}\right|_{\geqslant n}^2 + 1}\right) dv' s_1^{\nu+\rho_0} r^{\bar{\nu}+\rho_0-n} drdu$$

Applying the second case of (10) to dv' step by step (just as what we have done for $h_f(\lambda_j)$ and Σ_0) gives

$$J_\gamma = 2^n \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^{n-1} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \left(\left|\frac{v_1}{s_1}\right|_{\geqslant n}^2 + 1\right)^{\frac{\nu}{2}} K_\nu\left(\mu \sqrt{\left|\frac{v_1}{s_1}\right|_{\geqslant n}^2 + 1}\right) s_1^{\nu+\rho_0} r^{\bar{\nu}+\rho_0-n} drdu.$$

The computation shows (one should distinguish w in below from the w that has appeared earlier (as a point on $\Gamma_0\backslash G_0/K_0$ or G_0/K_0)):

$$n_w a_s k = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{s+s^{-1}}{2} + \frac{s^{-1}}{2}|w|^2, & \cdots \\ \frac{s-s^{-1}}{2} + \frac{s^{-1}}{2}|w|^2, & \cdots \\ w_1 \cdot s^{-1}, & \cdots \\ w_2 \cdot s^{-1}, & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ w_{d-1} \cdot s^{-1}, & \cdots \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{where } w = (w_1, \cdots, w_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$$

and

$$k(\gamma) n_u a_r = \begin{pmatrix} \left(1 + \frac{|u|^2}{2}\right) \frac{r+r^{-1}}{2} - \frac{|u|^2}{2} \frac{r-r^{-1}}{2}, & \cdots \\ \left(u_{11} \frac{|u|^2}{2} + \sum_{i=2}^n u_{1\,i} u_{i-1}\right) \frac{r+r^{-1}}{2} + \left[u_{11}\left(1 - \frac{|u|^2}{2}\right) - \sum_{i=2}^n u_{1\,i} u_{i-1}\right] \frac{r-r^{-1}}{2}, & \cdots \\ \left(u_{21} \frac{|u|^2}{2} + \sum_{i=2}^n u_{2\,i} u_{i-1}\right) \frac{r+r^{-1}}{2} + \left[u_{21}\left(1 - \frac{|u|^2}{2}\right) - \sum_{i=2}^n u_{2\,i} u_{i-1}\right] \frac{r-r^{-1}}{2}, & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \left(u_{d1} \frac{|u|^2}{2} + \sum_{i=2}^n u_{d\,i} u_{i-1}\right) \frac{r+r^{-1}}{2} + \left[u_{d1}\left(1 - \frac{|u|^2}{2}\right) - \sum_{i=2}^n u_{d\,i} u_{i-1}\right] \frac{r-r^{-1}}{2}, & \cdots \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $k(\gamma) n_u a_r = n_w a_s k$ for some $k \in K$. Then we have

$$\frac{s+s^{-1}}{2} + \frac{s^{-1}}{2}|w|^2 = \left(1 + \frac{|u|^2}{2}\right) \frac{r+r^{-1}}{2} - \frac{|u|^2}{2} \frac{r-r^{-1}}{2} \tag{15}$$

$$\frac{s-s^{-1}}{2} + \frac{s^{-1}}{2}|w|^2 = \left(u_{11} \frac{|u|^2}{2} + \sum_{i=2}^n u_{1\,i} u_{i-1}\right) \frac{r+r^{-1}}{2} + \left[u_{11}\left(1 - \frac{|u|^2}{2}\right) - \sum_{i=2}^n u_{1\,i} u_{i-1}\right] \frac{r-r^{-1}}{2} \tag{16}$$

$$w_i\, s^{-1} = \left(u_{i+1,\,1} \frac{|u|^2}{2} + \sum_{j=2}^n u_{i+1,\,j} u_{j-1}\right) \frac{r+r^{-1}}{2} + \left[u_{i+1,\,1}\left(1 - \frac{|u|^2}{2}\right) - \sum_{j=2}^n u_{i+1,\,j} u_{j-1}\right] \frac{r-r^{-1}}{2} \tag{17}$$

The equalities (15) and (16) imply

$$s^{-1} = \frac{1-u_{11}}{2} r + \left(\frac{1+u_{11}}{2} + \beta\right) r^{-1} \tag{18}$$

where $\beta = (1-u_{11}) \frac{|u|^2}{2} - \sum_{i=2}^n u_{1\,i} u_{i-1}$. Let $\alpha_i = u_{i+1,\,1} \frac{|u|^2}{2} + \sum_{j=2}^n u_{i+1,\,j} u_{j-1}$, then (17) reads

$$w_i\, s^{-1} = \frac{u_{i+1,\,1}}{2} r + \left(\alpha_i - \frac{u_{i+1,\,1}}{2}\right) r^{-1}, \quad 1 \leqslant i \leqslant d-1. \tag{19}$$

By the assumption that $\gamma w = n_{v_1} a_{s_1} \cdot o$, we have $v_1 = (w_0 + w) r_0$, $s_1 = r_0 s$. For any $1 \leqslant i \leqslant d-1$, denote

$$m_i = w_{0\,i} \frac{1-u_{11}}{2} + \frac{u_{i+1,\,1}}{2}, \qquad n_i = w_{0\,i} \left(\frac{1+u_{11}}{2} + \beta\right) + \left(\alpha_i - \frac{u_{i+1,\,1}}{2}\right).$$

Then the computation with the above terms shows that

$$f_\gamma(u, r) := \left|\frac{v_1}{s_1}\right|_{\geqslant n}^2 + 1 = \left|\frac{w_0 + w}{s}\right|_{\geqslant n}^2 + 1 = M(\gamma) r^2 + N_u(\gamma) r^{-2} + Q_u(\gamma)$$

where

$$M(\gamma)=\sum_{i=n}^{d-1}m_i^2,\quad N_u(\gamma)=\sum_{i=n}^{d-1}n_i^2,\quad Q_u(\gamma)=1+2\sum_{i=n}^{d-1}m_in_i. \tag{20}$$

Now we have:

$$J_\gamma=2^n\left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^{n-1}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\mathbb{R}_+}\left(\sqrt{f_\gamma(u,\,r)}\right)^{\nu}K_\nu\left(\mu\sqrt{f_\gamma(u,\,r)}\right)s_1^{\nu+\rho_0}r^{\bar\nu+\rho_0-n}drdu.$$

Write $f_\gamma(u,\,r)=\left(\sqrt{M(\gamma)}\,r-\frac{\sqrt{N_u(\gamma)}}{r}\right)^2+2\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}+Q_u(\gamma)$ and define

$$\delta_u(\gamma):=2\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}+Q_u(\gamma).$$

The parameter u in the subscript of N, Q and δ indicates that these numbers depend on u as well as γ. Note that M depends only on γ. For simplicity, we do not write γ, u explicitly in the notations m_i, n_i. The number $\delta_u(\gamma)$ has remarkable geometric meaning which can be interpreted from the following inequalities

$$\cosh\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(\gamma w,\,z)\right)=\frac{|v-v_1|^2+s_1^2}{2s_1t}+\frac{t}{2s_1}\geqslant 2\sqrt{\frac{|v-v_1|^2+s_1^2}{2s_1}\cdot\frac{1}{2s_1}}=\sqrt{\left|\frac{v-v_1}{s_1}\right|^2+1}\geqslant\sqrt{\left|\frac{v_1}{s_1}\right|_{\geqslant n}^2+1}.$$

The "=" at the first inequality can be achieved as t ranges among all positive numbers. The last step follows from the fact that v ranges among vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ (so the "=" can be achieved). To be more precise, the two "=" are simultaneously achieved at

$$v=\mathrm{Pr}_{n-1}(v_1),\quad t=\sqrt{s_1^2+|v_1|_{\geqslant n}^2}$$

where Pr_{n-1} means the projection map $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}\to\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $v=(v_1,\cdots,v_{d-1})\mapsto(v_1,\cdots,v_{n-1})$. Since r ranges over all positive numbers, we have $\left|\frac{v_1}{s_1}\right|_{\geqslant n}^2+1=f_\gamma(u,\,r)\geqslant\delta_u(\gamma)$ where "=" can be obtained when $\sqrt{M(\gamma)}\,r-\frac{\sqrt{N_u(\gamma)}}{r}=0$, i.e., $r=\sqrt{\frac{N_u(\gamma)}{M(\gamma)}}$ if $M(\gamma)\neq 0$, or $r=\infty$ if $M(\gamma)=0$. So $\delta_u(\gamma)$ measures the minimal hyperbolic distance between the two submanifolds $\gamma n_uA\cdot o$ and G_0/K_0:

$$\inf_{a\in A\cdot o,\,z\in G_0/K_0}\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(\gamma n_ua\cdot o,\,z)=\mathrm{arccosh}^+\left(\sqrt{\delta_u(\gamma)}\right). \tag{21}$$

By this formula we know that $\delta_u(\,\cdot\,)$ is well-defined over $\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma$ (but not on Γ/Γ_0). It is clear from the above discussion that the number $f_\gamma(u,\,r)$ also has remarkable geometric meaning: it measures the (hyperbolic) distance between the point $\gamma n_ua_r\cdot o$ and the submanifold G_0/K_0. More precisely,

$$\inf_{z\in G_0/K_0}\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(\gamma n_ua_r\cdot o,\,z)=\mathrm{arccosh}^+\left(\sqrt{f_\gamma(u,\,r)}\right).$$

The rest of this section is devoted to estimating Σ_1. The crucial ingredient in our argument is that, for each class $\tilde\gamma\in\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0\smallsetminus\{\tilde 1\}$ we shall carefully choose a representative element (which satisfies some universal properties) and deduce the estimate to a lattice counting problem. We need some technical conclusions whose proof will be postponed to Sect. 4.3. The first result to be used is

Proposition 2. *Let $n\geqslant 2$. For any fixed $u\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, we can find a representative element γ in each class $\tilde\gamma\in\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0\smallsetminus\{\tilde 1\}$ such that the following hold*

- *$M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)\geqslant c_1>0$ where c_1 is independent of u and the representative elements γ's.*
- *$\delta_u(\gamma)$ achieves its minimal value at some $u_\gamma\in\mathcal{F}\subset\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ where $\mathcal{F}$ is a fixed compact domain independent of γ's.*

- $M(\gamma) > c_2 > 0$ *where* c_2 *is independent of* γ*'s.*

In what follows we shall select the representative elements that satisfy the three properties in this proposition. Let $x = \sqrt{M(\gamma)}\, r - \frac{\sqrt{N_u(\gamma)}}{r}$, then $r = \frac{x+\sqrt{x^2+4\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}}{2\sqrt{M(\gamma)}}$ (since $M(\gamma) \neq 0$ by Proposition 2) and

$$J_\gamma = 2^n \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^{n-1} \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\mathbb{R}} F_\gamma(u,\, x)dxdu$$

where

$$F_\gamma(u,\, x) = s_1^{\nu+\rho_0} \left(\frac{x+\sqrt{x^2+4\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}}{2\sqrt{M(\gamma)}}\right)^{\overline{\nu}-\rho_0} \frac{\left(\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}\right)^{\nu} K_\nu\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}\right)}{\sqrt{x^2+4\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}}. \tag{22}$$

Recall that

$$s_1 = r_0 s = \frac{r_0}{\frac{1-u_{11}}{2}\, r + \left(\frac{1+u_{11}}{2}+\beta\right) r^{-1}}.$$

The term $\frac{1+u_{11}}{2}+\beta$ is nonnegative since by Cauchy inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1+u_{11}}{2}+\beta &= \left\{(1-u_{11})|u|^2 - 2\sum_{i=2}^{n} u_{1i}u_{i-1} + (1+u_{11})\right\}/2 \\
&\geqslant \sqrt{(1-u_{11}^2)\cdot|u|^2} - \sum_{i=2}^{n} u_{1i}u_{i-1} \\
&\geqslant \sqrt{\sum_{i=2}^{n} u_{1i}^2 \cdot \sum_{i=2}^{n} u_{i-1}^2} - \sum_{i=2}^{n} u_{1i}u_{i-1} \\
&\geqslant 0
\end{aligned}$$

The " = " holds if and only $u_{1i} = 0$ $(n+1 \leqslant i \leqslant d)$, $u_{i-1} = t_0 \cdot u_{1i}$ $(2 \leqslant i \leqslant n)$ for some constant t_0, and $(1-u_{11})|u|^2 = 1+u_{11}$. These conditions lead to at most one solution of u_γ (up to ± 1) for any given γ. Since we are doing integration along u, the possible solution u_γ can be neglected. Thus,

$$s_1 \leqslant \frac{r_0}{\sqrt{(1-u_{11})(1+u_{11})+2(1-u_{11})\beta}}.$$

In Sect. 4.3 we shall show

Proposition 3. $\sup\limits_{\gamma\in\Gamma\setminus\Gamma_0} \left|u_{11}(\gamma)\right| < 1.$

This proposition indicates that $(1-u_{11})(1+u_{11})+2(1-u_{11})\beta$ is a polynomial of degree 2 (with respect to each variable u_i). Hence, the denominator of s_1 (i.e., s^{-1}) grows (at least) polynomially with degree 1 and positive minimum value $\left(\text{as } \frac{1-u_{11}}{2}\, r + \left(\frac{1+u_{11}}{2}+\beta\right) r^{-1} \text{ is strictly positive if we neglect } u_\gamma\right)$. Multiplying proper $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma_{00}$ to the left side of γ if necessary, we assume that r_0 lies in a compact interval in $\mathbb{R}_+$.

Case 1. First we assume that $\left|\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0\right| < \infty$. The case $\left|\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0\right| = \infty$ will be treated later. When μ is large, $\mu\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}$ is also very large since $\delta_u(\gamma) \geqslant 1$. By the well-known asymptotic of K-Bessel function:

$$K_z(x) \sim \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2x}}\, e^{-x}, \quad \text{as } x \to \infty \tag{23}$$

the function $X^\nu K_\nu(\mu X)$ decreases with respect to X when μ is large. Hence

$$\left|\left(\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}\right)^{\nu} K_\nu\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}\right)\right| \leqslant \left(\sqrt{x^2+1}\right)^{\operatorname{Re}\nu} K_\nu\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+1}\right)$$

as $\mu \to \infty$. Since $K_\nu\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+1}\right) \sim K_{\mathrm{Re}\,\nu}\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+1}\right)$, we have

$$\left|\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}\right)^{\nu} K_\nu\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}\right) dx\right| \ll \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\sqrt{x^2+1}\right)^{\mathrm{Re}\,\nu} K_{\mathrm{Re}\,\nu}\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+1}\right) dx.$$

Let $y = x^2+1$ in right hand side of the above integral and apply the formula 6.592.12 of [**GR**]

$$\int_1^\infty x^{-\frac{b}{2}}(x-1)^{c-1} K_z\left(a\sqrt{x}\right) dx = 2^c\,\Gamma(c) a^{-c} K_{b-c}(a), \quad \mathrm{Re}(a) > 0,\ \mathrm{Re}(c) > 0,$$

we get

$$\int_0^\infty \left(\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}\right)^{\mathrm{Re}\,\nu} K_{\mathrm{Re}\,\nu}\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}\right) dx = \frac{\Gamma(1/2)}{\sqrt{2}}\mu^{-1/2} K_{-\mathrm{Re}\,\nu-1/2}(\mu). \tag{24}$$

By Cauchy inequality, we have

$$\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)} \geqslant 2\sum_{i=n}^{d-1} m_i n_i.$$

The term n_i expands as follows

$$n_i = |u|^2\,\frac{w_{0i}(1-u_{11})+u_{i+1,\,1}}{2} + \sum_{j=2}^{n}\left(u_{i+1,\,j} - w_{0i}u_{1j}\right)u_{j-1} + w_{0i}\frac{1+u_{11}}{2} - \frac{u_{i+1,\,1}}{2}. \tag{25}$$

Note that $m_i = \frac{w_{0i}(1-u_{11})+u_{i+1,\,1}}{2}$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{i=n}^{d-1} m_i n_i = |u|^2 \underbrace{\sum_{i=n}^{d-1} m_i^2}_{=M(\gamma)} + \sum_{i=n}^{d-1}\sum_{j=2}^{n} m_i\left(u_{i+1,\,j} - w_{0i}u_{1j}\right)u_{j-1} + \sum_{i=n}^{d-1} m_i\left(w_{0i}\frac{1+u_{11}}{2} - \frac{u_{i+1,\,1}}{2}\right). \tag{26}$$

This means that $\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}$ grows polynomially with degree 2 (with respect to each variable u_i) with a positive minimum value for all $\gamma \notin \Gamma_0$ (by Proposition 2).

When $x \geqslant 0$, one has

$$\left(x + \sqrt{x^2 + 4\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}\right)^{\mathrm{Re}\,\nu-\rho_0} \leqslant \left(2\sqrt[4]{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}\right)^{\mathrm{Re}\,\nu-\rho_0}$$

noting that $\mathrm{Re}\,\nu - \rho_0 \leqslant 0$. As a consequence,

$$\left|\left(\frac{x + \sqrt{x^2 + 4\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}}{2\sqrt{M(\gamma)}}\right)^{\overline{\nu}-\rho_0} \frac{s_1^{\nu+\rho_0}}{\sqrt{x^2 + 4\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}}\right| \ll \left(\sqrt[4]{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}\right)^{-(\rho_0-\mathrm{Re}\,\nu+1)} \left(s^{-1}\right)^{-(\rho_0+\mathrm{Re}\,\nu)}.$$

We have known that both $\sqrt[4]{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}$ and s^{-1} grow (at least) polynomially with degree 1 (with respect to each variable u_i) with positive minimum value. Since $\rho_0 = \frac{n-1}{2} > 0$ for $n \geqslant 2$, the following integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(\sqrt[4]{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}\right)^{-(\rho_0-\mathrm{Re}\,\nu+1)} (s^{-1})^{-(\rho_0+\mathrm{Re}\,\nu)} du$$

converges as the function inside is positive and has polynomial degree (at most)

$$-(\rho_0 - \mathrm{Re}\,\nu + 1) - (\rho_0 + \mathrm{Re}\,\nu) = -2\rho_0 - 1 < -1.$$

Note that the term $\left(2\sqrt{M(\gamma)}\right)^{\rho_0-\overline{\nu}}$ in $F_\gamma(u,x)$ does not give essential contribution to the upper bound since $\left|\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma_0/\Gamma_0\right| < \infty$. In view of (24), we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}\int_0^\infty F_\gamma(u,\,x)dxdu \ll \mu^{-1/2}K_{-\mathrm{Re}\,\nu-1/2}(\mu) \ll \mu^{-1}e^{-\mu}. \tag{27}$$

When $x \leqslant -\omega$ with any $\omega \in (0,1)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(x+\sqrt{x^2+4\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}\right)^{\operatorname{Re}\nu-\rho_0}\\
=\;&\left(\frac{\sqrt{x^2+4\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}-x}{4\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}\right)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\\
=\;&(-x)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\left(\frac{\sqrt{1+\frac{4\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}{x^2}}+1}{4\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}\right)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\\
=\;&(-x)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{16M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}+\frac{1}{4x^2\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}}+\frac{1}{4\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}\right)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\\
\overset{(\sharp)}{\leqslant}\;&(-x)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{16M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}+\sqrt{\frac{1}{4x^2\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}}+\frac{1}{4\sqrt{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}\right)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\\
=\;&(-x)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\left(2\sqrt[4]{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}\right)^{-(\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu)}\left(\frac{1}{-x}+\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}}\right)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\\
\leqslant\;&(-x)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\left(2\sqrt[4]{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}\right)^{-(\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu)}\left(\frac{1}{-x}+\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{c_1}}\right)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\\
\ll\;&(-x)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\left(2\sqrt[4]{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}\right)^{-(\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu)}\left(\frac{1}{\omega}\right)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}
\end{aligned}$$

provided that ω is small enough. At the step $(\sharp)$ we have used the inequality $\sqrt{a+b} \leqslant \sqrt{a}+\sqrt{b}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}\int_{-\infty}^{-\omega}F_\gamma(u,\,x)dxdu \ll\;&\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}\int_{-\infty}^{-\omega}(-x)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\left(2\sqrt[4]{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}\right)^{-(\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu)}\frac{1}{\omega^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}}\\
&\times\left(2\sqrt[4]{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}\right)^{-1}(s^{-1})^{-(\rho_0+\operatorname{Re}\nu)}\left(\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}\right)^{\nu}K_\nu\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}\right)dxdu
\end{aligned}$$

As before, the integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}\left(\sqrt[4]{M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)}\right)^{-(\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu+1)}(s^{-1})^{-(\rho_0+\operatorname{Re}\nu)}du$$

converges. Since $K_\nu\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+1}\right) \sim \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu\sqrt{x^2+1}}}e^{-\mu\sqrt{x^2+1}}$ as $\mu\to\infty$, the ratio of $K_\nu\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+1}\right)$ at $x=0$ and $\mu^{-1/2}$ is asymptotically equal to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{1+\mu^{-1}}}\cdot\frac{e^{-\mu}}{e^{-\mu\sqrt{\mu^{-1}+1}}}$$

which converges to $e^{1/2}$ as $\mu\to\infty$. Let $\omega=\mu^{-1/2}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-\infty}^{-\mu^{-1/2}}(-x)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\left(\sqrt{x^2+1}\right)^{\nu}K_\nu\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+1}\right)dx\\
&\qquad\asymp\int_{-\infty}^{0}(-x)^{\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}\left(\sqrt{x^2+1}\right)^{\nu}K_\nu\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+1}\right)dx,\quad\text{as }\mu\to\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}\int_{-\infty}^{0}F_\gamma(u,\,x)dxdu$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\asymp \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \int_{-\infty}^{-\mu^{-1/2}} F_\gamma(u,\, x) dx du \\
&\ll \mu^{(\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu)/2} \int_{-\infty}^{-\mu^{-1/2}} (-x)^{\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu} \left(\sqrt{x^2 + \delta_u(\gamma)}\right)^{\operatorname{Re}\nu} K_{\operatorname{Re}\nu}\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}\right) dx \\
&< \mu^{(\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu)/2} \int_{-\infty}^{0} (-x)^{\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu} \left(\sqrt{x^2 + 1}\right)^{\operatorname{Re}\nu} K_{\operatorname{Re}\nu}\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+1}\right) dx \\
&\overset{(*)}{=} \mu^{(\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu)/2} \cdot 2^{(\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu - 1)/2} \mu^{-(\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu + 1)/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu + 1}{2}\right) K_{-\operatorname{Re}\nu - (\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu + 1)/2}(\mu) \\
&\ll \mu^{-1} e^{-\mu} \qquad (28)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the step $(*)$ is computed in the same way with (24). By (27) and (28),

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} F_\gamma(u,\, x) dx du \ll \mu^{-1} e^{-\mu}$$

which proves (14).

Case 2. Now we deal with the case $\left|\Gamma_0 \backslash \Gamma_0 / \Gamma_0\right| = \infty$. By (22) and Proposition 2 we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|J_\gamma\right| \ll \mu^{-(n-1)/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} s^{\rho_0 + \operatorname{Re}\nu} \left(2\sqrt{M(\gamma)}\right)^{\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu} \left(x + \sqrt{x^2 + 4\sqrt{M(\gamma) N_u(\gamma)}}\right)^{\operatorname{Re}\nu - \rho_0} \\
\times K_\nu\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2 + \delta_u(\gamma)}\right) dx du. \qquad (29)
\end{aligned}
$$

By (23) and the inequality $\sqrt{a+b} \geqslant \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\left(\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}\right)$,

$$K_\nu\left(\mu\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}\right) \sim \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}}} e^{-\mu\sqrt{x^2+\delta_u(\gamma)}} \ll \mu^{-1/2} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\mu|x|} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\mu\sqrt{\delta_u(\gamma)}}. \qquad (30)$$

Combining (29) and (30) yields

$$\left|J_\gamma\right| \ll \mu^{-n/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} s^{\rho_0 + \operatorname{Re}\nu} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\mu|x|} \left(x + \sqrt{x^2 + 4\sqrt{M(\gamma) N_u(\gamma)}}\right)^{\operatorname{Re}\nu - \rho_0} \left(2\sqrt{M(\gamma)}\right)^{\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\mu\sqrt{\delta_u(\gamma)}} dx du.$$

The integral

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} s^{\rho_0 + \operatorname{Re}\nu} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\mu|x|} \left(x + \sqrt{x^2 + 4\sqrt{M(\gamma) N_u(\gamma)}}\right)^{\operatorname{Re}\nu - \rho_0} dx$$

converges and is uniformly upper bounded by a constant since the function inside has exponential decay and μ is large (note that s is a positive rational function of x).

As $\delta_u(\gamma)$ grows polynomially with respect to the variables $\sqrt{M(\gamma)}\, u_i$, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_0 \backslash \Gamma / \Gamma_0 \smallsetminus \{\tilde{1}\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(2\sqrt{M(\gamma)}\right)^{\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\mu\sqrt{\delta_u(\gamma)}} du \\
= &\sum_{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_0 \backslash \Gamma / \Gamma_0 \smallsetminus \{\tilde{1}\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(2\sqrt{M(\gamma)}\right)^{\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu} e^{-\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\mu\sqrt{\varepsilon^2\delta_u(\gamma) + (1-\varepsilon^2)\delta_u(\gamma)}} du \\
\leqslant &\sum_{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_0 \backslash \Gamma / \Gamma_0 \smallsetminus \{\tilde{1}\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(2\sqrt{M(\gamma)}\right)^{\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mu\varepsilon\sqrt{\delta_u(\gamma)}} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mu\sqrt{1-\varepsilon^2}\sqrt{\delta_u(\gamma)}} du \\
\ll &\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \left(\sqrt{M(\gamma)}\right)^{-\rho_0 - \operatorname{Re}\nu} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mu\varepsilon\sqrt{\delta_u(\gamma)}} d\left(\sqrt{M(\gamma)}\, u\right) \times \sum_{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma_0 \backslash \Gamma / \Gamma_0 \smallsetminus \{\tilde{1}\}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mu\sqrt{1-\varepsilon^2}\sqrt{\delta_{u_*}(\gamma)}}
\end{aligned}
$$

for some $u_* \in \mathcal{F}$. At the second step we have used the inequality $\sqrt{a+b} \geqslant \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(\sqrt{a}+\sqrt{b})$. At the last step we have used Proposition 2. Note that $\left(\sqrt{M(\gamma)}\right)^{-\rho_0-\operatorname{Re}\nu}$ is uniformly upper bounded since $M(\gamma) > c_2 > 0$. Thus, the integral in the last step converges. It follows that

$$J_\gamma \ll \mu^{-n/2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mu\sqrt{1-\varepsilon^2}} \sqrt{\delta_{u_*}(\gamma)} \tag{31}$$

In Sect. 4.3 we shall show

Proposition 4. *For any fixed $u \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and sequence $\Lambda_u \subset \Gamma$ where each element in Λ_u represents exactly one double class in $\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0$, there exist a positive number c_3 such that*

$$\pi_{\Lambda_u}(x) := \#\{\gamma \in \Lambda_u \,|\, \delta_u(\gamma) \leqslant x\} \leqslant c_3 \cdot x^{(d-n)/2}, \quad \text{as } x \to \infty.$$

We may arrange the order of the elements in Λ_u and get $\Lambda_u = \{\gamma_j\}$ such that $\delta_u(\gamma_j)$ is nondecreasing as j grows. Then we have

Proposition 5. $\delta_u(\gamma_j) \gg j^{\frac{1}{(d-n)/2+\beta}}$ *for any fixed $\beta > 0$ and u.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $\delta\left(\tilde{\gamma}_{\left[j^{(d-n)/2+\beta}\right]}\right) \gg j$, where $[x]$ means taking the maximal integer that does not exceed x. Assume that there exists a sequence $\{j_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that j_i increases as i grows and

$$\frac{\delta\left(\tilde{\gamma}_{\left[j_i^{(d-n)/2+\beta}\right]}\right)}{j_i} \to 0$$

as $i \to \infty$. Then all $\tilde{\gamma}_{\left[j_i^{(d-n)/2+\beta}\right]}$ are contained in the set $\{\tilde{\gamma} \,|\, \delta(\tilde{\gamma}) \leqslant j_i\}$. This implies that $\pi(j_i) \geqslant \left[j_i^{(d-n)/2+\beta}\right]$ since $\delta(\gamma_j)$ is nondecreasing as j grows, contradicting Proposition 4. □

Let $u = u_*$, then by Proposition 5 there exists $j_0 > 0$ such that $\delta_{u_*}(\gamma_j) \geqslant \frac{4}{1-\varepsilon^2} j^{2/d}$ for any $j \geqslant j_0$. Denote $J_j = J_{\gamma_j}$. By (31) we have

$$\sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} J_j \ll \mu^{-n/2} \sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} e^{-\mu j^{1/d}} < \mu^{-n/2} \int_1^{\infty} e^{-\mu x^{1/d}} dx = d\mu^{-n/2} \int_1^{\infty} e^{-\mu y} y^{d-1} dy$$

where we made the variable exchange $x^{1/d} \to y$ in the last step. Integration by parts shows that the integral on the right hand side is upper bounded by $\mu^{-1}e^{-\mu}$. Hence,

$$\sum_{j=j_0}^{\infty} J_j \ll \mu^{-(n+2)/2} e^{-\mu}.$$

As for those J_j where $1 \leqslant j \leqslant j_0$, we apply the argument that has been done for the case $\left|\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0\right| < \infty$ and get $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{j_0} J_j \ll \mu^{-(n+1)/2} e^{-\mu}$, thereby we have shown (14).

Putting the data on geometric and spectral sides together, we get

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^d \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^{d-1} K_{\nu_j}(\mu) \left|P_Y(\phi_j,\psi)\right|^2 \quad = \quad b_\nu \cdot \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^{n-1} K_{\bar{\nu}}(\mu) + \mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\mu}\mu^{-(n+1)/2}\right)$$

In view of the asymptotic (23) of K-Bessel function, multiplying $2^{-d}\left(\sqrt{\frac{2\mu}{\pi}}\right)^n e^{\mu}$ on both sides of this formula and taking the limitation $\mu \to \infty$ yields

$$\lim_{\mu\to\infty} e^{\mu} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^{d-n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} K_{\nu_j}(\mu) \left|P_Y(\phi_j,\psi)\right|^2 = c_\nu. \tag{32}$$

where $c_\nu = 2^{-d} b_\nu$. The K-Bessel function $K_{\nu_i}(\mu)$ is positive for $\nu_j \in i\,\mathbb{R}$, so the right hand side of (32) is nonnegative. Since $b_\nu \neq 0$ (see Sect. 4.1), the scalar c_ν is positive.

Proof of Theorem 1. Assume that there are only finitely many ϕ_j such that $P_Y(\phi_j,\psi) \neq 0$. By the aysmptotic formula (23), the left hand side of (32) is equal to zero, a contradiction as $c_\nu > 0$. □

4.3 Proofs of Proposition 2, 3, 4

In this section we prove the propositions that have been used in the previous section. The commutativity relations listed below, as well as (12), will be used frequently:

$$\mathrm{diag}(1,1,k)\cdot n_u = n_{uk^T}\cdot \mathrm{diag}(1,1,k),\quad u\in\mathbb{R}^{d-1},\quad k\in SO(d-1). \tag{33}$$

$$\mathrm{diag}(1,-1,k')\cdot a_r = a_{r^{-1}}\cdot \mathrm{diag}(1,-1,k'),\quad k'\in O(d-1),\ \det(k')=-1. \tag{34}$$

These properties are easy to verify. Under our assumption on Γ_{00} (see Sect. 2.2), there exists $\gamma_0 = a_{\ell_0}k_0 \in AM_0$ such that $\Gamma_{00}=\langle\gamma_0\rangle$. It is clear that $\ell_0\neq 1$. We might as well assume that $\ell_0>1$.

Lemma 2. *$u_{11}(\gamma)\neq\pm 1$ for any $\gamma\in\Gamma\smallsetminus\Gamma_0$.*

Proof. Assume that $u_{11}(\gamma)=1$, i.e., $\gamma\in(ANM\cap\Gamma)\smallsetminus\Gamma_0$. Write $\gamma = a_{r_0}n_{w_0}k(\gamma)\in ANM$ where $k(\gamma)=\mathrm{diag}(1,1,k)$ with $k\in SO(d-1)$. Multiplying $\gamma_1 = a_{r_1}\mathrm{diag}(1,1,k_1)$, $\gamma_2 = a_{r_2}\mathrm{diag}(1,1,k_2)\in\Gamma_{00}$ (where k_1, $k_2\in SO(d-1)$) to the right and left sides of γ yields

$$\gamma_2\gamma\gamma_1 = a_{r_2r_0r_1}n_{w_0k_2^Tr_1^{-1}}\cdot\mathrm{diag}(1,1,k_2kk_1).$$

Here we have use the commutativity relations (12) and (33). With proper r_1, r_2, we may assume that $r_2r_0r_1$ lies in $(1,\ell_0]$, and $\left|w_0k_2^Tr_1^{-1}\right| = |w_0|r_1^{-1}$ is small enough. This means that $\gamma_2\gamma\gamma_1$ is close to $AM\cap\Gamma=\Gamma_{00}$. The discreteness of Γ implies that $\gamma_2\gamma\gamma_1$ lies in $\Gamma_{00}\subset\Gamma_0$, whence $\gamma\in\Gamma_0$. This contradicts the assumption. The case that $u_{11}(\gamma)=-1$ can be disproved in the same fashion where we should use (34). □

Proof of Proposition 3. If there exists a sequence $\{\gamma_i\}\subset\Gamma\smallsetminus\Gamma_0$ such that $u_{11}(\gamma_i)\to 1$, then γ_i is close to $ANM\cap\Gamma$. By Lemma Lemma 2 and the discreteness of Γ, γ_i lies in $ANM\cap\Gamma=\Gamma_0$ for large enough i. However, we have assumed that $\gamma\notin\Gamma_0$. The case $u_{11}(\gamma_i)\to -1$ can be shown analogously. □

Lemma 3. *The image of $\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma$ under the map $\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma\to\Gamma_0\backslash G$ is discrete and has no accumulation point in $\Gamma_0\backslash G$ with respect to the topology defined by the invariant Riemann metric of $\Gamma_0\backslash G$.*

Proof. We show the first part of the lemma since the second part follows in the same way. Assume that the sequence $\{\Gamma_0\cdot\gamma_i\}\subset\Gamma_0\backslash G$ converges to $\Gamma_0\cdot\gamma$ where γ_i, $\gamma\in\Gamma$, and $\Gamma_0\cdot\gamma_i\neq\Gamma_0\cdot\gamma_j$ for $i\neq j$. Then there exist a sequence $\{\eta_i\}\subset\Gamma_0$ and a compact neighborhood W_i of e such that $\gamma^{-1}\eta_i\gamma_i\in W_i\cap\Gamma$. By passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that $\left\{\gamma^{-1}\eta_i\gamma_i\right\}$ converges. The compact neighborhood W_i can be close to e arbitrarily for i large, which means that $W_i\cap\Gamma=\{e\}$ for i large enough. Hence, $\gamma^{-1}\eta_i\gamma_i=e$ for i large enough. As a consequence, $\Gamma_0\cdot\gamma_i=\Gamma_0\cdot\gamma_j$ for i, j large enough, a contradiction. □

Proof of Proposition 4. First we assume that $M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma)\neq 0$. For given $\gamma=a_{r_0}n_{w_0}k(\gamma)\in\Lambda_u$ and $u\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ there exist (unique) $a_r\in A$ and $\gamma_1 = a_{r_1}\cdot\mathrm{diag}(1,1,k_1,k_2)\in\Gamma_{00}$ with $r\in(1,\ell_0]$ and $k_1\in O(n-1)$, $k_2\in O(d-n)$, such that $\gamma n_u a_{rr_1}\cdot o = a_t n_v\cdot o$ where $|v|^2_{\geqslant n}+1=\delta_u(\gamma)$. Here, rr_1 is the unique positive solution of the equation $\sqrt{M(\gamma)}\,x-\frac{\sqrt{N_u(\gamma)}}{x}=0$ (see Sect. 4.2 for the meaning of the notations). Thus, modulo $\left\{\ell_0^n\,\middle|\,n\in\mathbb{Z}\right\}$ (multiplicatively), r and r_1 (then, a_r and γ_1) are unique. Clearly we have: $\gamma n_u a_{rr_1}\cdot o = \gamma\gamma_1 a_r n_{(rr_1)^{-1}uk_1}\cdot o$ (here we have used (12), (33)). For $v=(v_1,v_2,\cdots,v_{d-1})\in\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, denote

$$v_{<n}=(v_1,\cdots,v_{n-1},0,\cdots,0)\quad\text{and}\quad v_{\geqslant n}=(0,\cdots,0,v_n,\cdots,v_{d-1}).$$

Let G_0^* denote a fundamental domain of $\Gamma_0\backslash G_0$ in G_0 which contains $\Gamma_0\cdot e$. Then there exists (unique) $\gamma_2\in\Gamma_0$ such that $\gamma_2 a_t n_v\cdot o=\gamma_2 a_t n_{v_{<n}}\cdot n_{\geqslant n}\cdot o$ such that $\gamma_2 a_t n_{v_{<n}}$ lies in G_0^*. Define

$$\mathbb{R}^{d-1}_n := \left\{v_{\geqslant n}\,\middle|\,v\in\mathbb{R}^{d-1}\right\}$$

and

$$\Omega_u(x) := \left\{ g_0 n_u k \in G \,\middle|\, g_0 \in G_0^*,\ u \in \mathbb{R}_n^{n-1},\ |u|^2 + 1 \leqslant x,\ k \in K \right\} \subset G.$$

Denote by $\gamma^*(u)$ the element $\gamma\gamma_1 a_r n_{(rr_1)^{-1}uk_1} \cdot o \in \Omega_u(x)$. When $M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma) = 0$, the existence of $\gamma^*(u)$ in $\Omega_u(x + \varepsilon_0)$ is clear in view of the above argument: if $M(\gamma) = 0$, one chooses $\gamma_1 = \gamma_0^\ell$ for $\ell > 0$ large enough; if $N_u(\gamma) = 0$, one chooses $\gamma_1 = \gamma_0^\ell$ for $\ell < 0$ and $|\ell|$ large enough. Here ε_0 is a positive, small enough number.

Lemma 4. *$\gamma^*(u) \neq \eta^*(w)$ for any u, $w \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and γ, η of different classes in $\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0$.*

Proof. Like $\gamma^*(u)$, we have: $\eta^*(w) = \eta_2\eta\eta_1 a_\ell n_{(\ell\ell_1)^{-1}w\tau_1} \in \Omega_x^*$ for some $\ell \in (1, \ell_0]$, $\eta_2 \in \Gamma_0$ and $\eta_1 = a_{\ell_1} k_1' \in \Gamma_{00}$ where $k_1' = \mathrm{diag}(1,\, 1,\, \tau_1, \tau_2) \in M_0$. If $\gamma^*(u) = \eta^*(w)$, then

$$a_r n_{(rr_1)^{-1}uk_1} \cdot n_{-(\ell\ell_1)^{-1}w\tau_1}\, a_{\ell^{-1}} = \gamma_1^{-1}\gamma^{-1}\gamma_2^{-1} \cdot \eta_2\eta\eta_1 \in \Gamma \cap AN_0.$$

It is clear that $AN_0 \cap \Gamma \subset \Gamma_0$. Hence, $\gamma_1^{-1}\gamma^{-1}\gamma_2^{-1} \cdot \eta_2\eta\eta_1 \in \Gamma_0$ which implies that γ and η are of the same class in $\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0$, contradicting our assumption. □

This lemma tells us that, those $\gamma^*(u) \in \Omega_u(x)$ are distinguishable with respect to γ (of different classes) and u. A further property is about the discreteness of $\gamma^*(u)$:

Lemma 5. *For any sequence of pairs*

$$\left\{ \left(\gamma_{i1}^*(u_i), \gamma_{i2}^*(w_i)\right) \,\middle|\, \gamma_{i1},\, \gamma_{i2} \in \Gamma \smallsetminus \Gamma_0,\, \tilde{\gamma}_{i1} \neq \tilde{\gamma}_{i2},\, \gamma_{i1}^*(u_i) \in \Omega_{u_i}(\infty),\, \gamma_{i2}^*(w_i) \in \Omega_{w_i}(\infty),\, u_i,\, w_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \right\}_{i=1}^{\infty},$$

$\gamma_{i1}^*(u_i)$ and $\gamma_{i2}^*(w_i)$ can not be close enough (as $i \to \infty$) with respect to the topology of G.

Proof. Let $\gamma_{i1}^*(u_i) = \gamma_{i1}'\gamma_{i1}\gamma_{i1}'' a_{r_{i1}} n_{u_{i1}} \in \Omega_{u_i}(\infty)$ and $\gamma_{i2}^*(w_i) = \gamma_{i2}'\gamma_{i2}\gamma_{i2}'' a_{r_{i2}} n_{u_{i2}} \in \Omega_{w_i}(\infty)$ for some γ_{i1}', $\gamma_{i2}' \in \Gamma_0$, γ_{i1}'', $\gamma_{i2}'' \in \Gamma_{00}$, r_{i1}, $r_{i2} \in (1, \ell_0]$ and u_{i1}, $u_{i2} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Assume that $\gamma_{i1}^*(u_i)$ and $\gamma_{i2}^*(w_i)$ are close enough as $i \to \infty$, then $\left(\gamma_{i1}^*(u_i)\right)^{-1} \gamma_{i2}^*(w_i) \to 1$, that is, $n_{-u_{i1}} a_{r_{i1}^{-1}} \left(\gamma_{i1}'\gamma_{i1}\gamma_{i1}''\right)^{-1} \left(\gamma_{i2}'\gamma_{i2}\gamma_{i2}''\right) a_{r_{i2}} n_{u_{i2}} \in U_i$ where U_i is a compact neighborhood of e that can be small enough for large i. It follows that $\eta_i := \left(\gamma_{i1}'\gamma_{i1}\gamma_{i1}''\right)^{-1} \left(\gamma_{i2}'\gamma_{i2}\gamma_{i2}''\right)$ lies in $V_i := a_{r_{i1}} n_{u_{i1}}\, U_i\, n_{-u_{i2}} a_{r_{i2}^{-1}}$, a compact neighborhood of $a_{r_{i1}} n_{(u_{i1}-u_{i2})} a_{r_{i2}^{-1}} \in AN_0$ which is contained in AN_0V where V is a fixed compact neighborhood of e (note that V_i is small enough for large i). Since $\Gamma_0\backslash G_0$ is compact, the image of V_i in $\Gamma_0\backslash G$ is also compact. This implies that, passing to a subsequence if necessary we may assume that $\Gamma_0 \cdot \eta_i$ converges in $\Gamma_0\backslash G$. By Lemma 3, the sequence $\{\Gamma_0 \cdot \eta_i\}$ becomes stable for large enough i. Hence, $\tilde{\gamma}_i = \tilde{\gamma}_j$ for large i and j, a contradiction. □

By Lemma 4, to count $\pi_u(x)$ it suffices to count the representative elements $\gamma_i^*(u)$ that lie in $\Omega_u(x)$. Lemma 5 tells us that these $\gamma_i^*(u)$ are discrete and have no accumulation point with respect to the topology of G. The topology of G, when restricted to $\Omega_u(x)$ is equivalent to the Euclidean topology of $\mathbb{R}^{d-n}$ since the components G_0^* and K of $\Omega_u(x)$ are compact. Thus, $\pi_u(x)$ is (upper) bounded by the volume of $\Omega_u(x)$ which is of order $x^{(d-n)/2}$. This proves Proposition 4. □

Corollary 1. *Assume that $|\,\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma/\Gamma_0| = \infty$, then for any fixed $u \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ the unique accumulation point of $\{\delta_u(\gamma_i) \,|\, \tilde{\gamma}_i \neq \tilde{\gamma}_j\}$ is ∞.*

Lemma 6. *If $M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma) = 0$, then $Q_u(\gamma) = \delta_u(\gamma) = 1$.*

Proof. This is clear in view of (20). □

Lemma 7. *For any $\gamma \notin \Gamma_0$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, $M(\gamma)$ and $N_u(\gamma)$ can not be zero simultaneously.*

Proof. Assume that $M(\gamma) = N_u(\gamma) = 0$ for some $\gamma \notin \Gamma_0$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. As before, let $\gamma n_u a_r = a_{r_0 s} n_{\frac{w_0+w}{s}} k$ (see Sect. 4.2). Then $\left|\frac{w_0+w}{s}\right|^2_{\geqslant n} + 1 = M(\gamma)r^2 + \frac{N_u(\gamma)}{r^2} + Q_u(\gamma) \equiv 1$ for any $r > 0$ (see Lemma 6). This means that (see (21))

$$\gamma n_u A{\cdot}o \subset G_0/K_0.$$

As $n_u A{\cdot}o \subset G_0/K_0$, we have $\gamma \in \Gamma_0$, a contradiction. □

Proof of Proposition 2. As before (see Sect. 4.2), let $w = n_u a_r{\cdot}o$, $z = n_v a_t{\cdot}o \in G_0/K_0$, $\gamma = a_{r_0} n_{w_0} k(\gamma)$. Write $k(\gamma) n_u a_r{\cdot}o = n_w a_s{\cdot}o$. Then $\gamma n_u a_r{\cdot}o = n_{v_1} a_{s_1}{\cdot}o$ where $v_1 = (w_0 + w)r_0$, $s_1 = r_0 s$.

First we show that, for each class $\tilde{\gamma} \neq \tilde{1}$ there exists representative element γ such that $M(\gamma)N_u(\gamma) \neq 0$ for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Recall that $\frac{1+u_{11}}{2} + \beta = 0$ has at most one solution $u(\gamma)$ of u up to ± 1. Multiplying $\gamma_1 \in \Gamma_0$ to the left side of the geodesic $C_u := n_u A{\cdot}o \subset G_0/K_0$ and denote the point $P \in \gamma_1 C_u$ as $n_{u'} a_{r'}{\cdot}o$. Clearly, we can choose proper γ_1 such that $u' \neq u(\gamma)$ for any $P \in \gamma_1 C_u$. Replacing γ with $\gamma\gamma_1$ if necessary, we assume that $\frac{1+u_{11}}{2} + \beta \neq 0$. Note that the condition $n \geqslant 2$ is necessary in the above discussion because the submanifold G_0/K_0 should be large enough to allow inside the geodesic $\gamma_1 C_u$ (and $\gamma_2 C_u$ in below). If $n = 1$, such property does not hold. As $r \to \infty$, we have:

$$s_1 = \frac{r_0}{\frac{1-u_{11}}{2} r + \left(\frac{1+u_{11}}{2} + \beta\right) r^{-1}} \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad w_i = \frac{\frac{u_{i+1,\,1}}{2} r + \left(\alpha_i - \frac{u_{i+1,\,1}}{2}\right) r^{-1}}{\frac{1-u_{11}}{2} r + \left(\frac{1+u_{11}}{2} + \beta\right) r^{-1}} \to \frac{u_{i+1,1}}{1-u_{11}} =: \tilde{w}_i.$$

Denote $\tilde{w} = (\tilde{w}_1, \cdots, \tilde{w}_{d-1})$. Then $\tilde{w}$ does not depend on u (as $r \to \infty$). It follows that $\xi_\gamma := \lim_{r\to\infty} \gamma n_u a_r{\cdot}o = \lim_{r\to 0^+} n_{(w_0+\tilde{w})r_0} a_r{\cdot}o$ is a fixed point lying in the boundary $\mathcal{X}$ of G/K where $\mathcal{X} := \{\lim_{r\to 0^+} n_w a_r{\cdot}o \,|\, w \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}\}$. Note that ξ_γ is independent of u. As $r \to 0$, we have $s_1 \to 0$ and $w_i \to \frac{\alpha_i - \frac{u_{i+1,1}}{2}}{\frac{1+u_{11}}{2} + \beta} =: \mathring{w}_i$. Denote $\mathring{w} = (\mathring{w}_1, \cdots, \mathring{w}_{d-1})$ and $\xi_\gamma(u) = \lim_{r\to 0^+} n_{(w_0+\mathring{w})} a_r{\cdot}o \in \mathcal{X}$. The geodesic on G/K is either a straight line or a semicircle, each of which is vertical to $\mathcal{X}$ (in the $\mathbb{R}^{d-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ model). Our argument in above shows that γC_u is a semicircle with two end points ξ_γ, $\xi_\gamma(u) \in \mathcal{X}$. Multiply $\gamma_2 \in \Gamma_0$ on the left side of the geodesic C_u and assume that $\gamma_2 C_u$ is a semicircle on G_0/K_0 with two end points $P_1 = \lim_{r\to 0^+} n_{u_1} a_r{\cdot}o$, $P_2 = \lim_{r\to 0^+} n_{u_2} a_r{\cdot}o$ where u_1, $u_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. We can choose γ_2 such that the resulting u_1, u_2 are large enough, then $u(\gamma) \neq v'$ for any $n_{v'} a_{t'}{\cdot}o \in \gamma_2 C_u$. This implies that $\frac{1+u_{11}}{2} + \beta \neq 0$ for $\gamma\gamma_2$ (u is the same with before). Define $\mathcal{Y} := \{\lim_{r\to 0^+} n_w a_r{\cdot}o \,|\, w \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}\}$, the boundary of G_0/K_0. Then $\mathcal{Y}$ is a proper subset of $\mathcal{X}$.

- If $M(\gamma) = 0$, then $N_u(\gamma) \neq 0$ by Lemma 7. It follows from Lemma 6 that $f_\gamma(u, r) = N_u(\gamma)/r^2 + 1 \to 1 = \delta_u(\gamma)$. The (minimal) distance between the geodesic γC_u and the submanifold G_0/K_0, which is 0, is obtained at the two points $n_{v_1} a_{s_1}{\cdot}o \in \gamma C_u$ and $n_v a_t{\cdot}o \in G_0/K_0$ where $v_1 = (w_0 + \tilde{w})r_0$, $s_1 = 0^+$, $v = \mathrm{Pr}_{n-1}(v_1)$, $t = \sqrt{s_1^2 + |v_1|^2_{\geqslant n}}$. Hence, ξ_γ lies in $\mathcal{Y}$, i.e., the last $(d-n)$ components of $(w_0 + \tilde{w})$ vanish. We claim that γP_1, $\gamma_2 P_2 \notin \mathcal{Y}$. The reason is simple. Assume that $\gamma P_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$, then the geodesic $\gamma n_{u_1} A{\cdot}o$ must lie in G_0/K_0 since the two end points γP_1 and $\lim_{r\to\infty} n_{u_1} a_r{\cdot}o$ both lie in $\mathcal{Y}$. This implies that $\gamma \in \Gamma_0$, whereas we have assumed that $\gamma \notin \Gamma_0$. The case γP_2 is shown in the fashion. As a consequence, the geodesic γC_u either intersects G_0/K_0 or is away from G_0/K_0, i.e., $\delta_u(\gamma\gamma_2) > 1$. The first case indicates that the (minimal) distance between $\gamma\gamma_2 C_u$ and the submanifold G_0/K_0 is achieved at a finite r, hence $M(\gamma')N_u(\gamma') \neq 0$ (otherwise the distance will be achieved at $r = 0$ or ∞). By Lemma 6, the second case directly indicates $M(\gamma\gamma_2)N_u(\gamma\gamma_2) \neq 0$ since $\delta_u(\gamma\gamma_2) > 1$ in this situation. Replacing γ with $\gamma\gamma_2$, we are done.

- If $N_u(\gamma) = 0$ for some $u \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, then $M(\gamma) \neq 0$ by Lemma 7, and $f_\gamma(u, r) \to 1 = \delta_u(\gamma)$ as $r \to 0^+$. Due to the same reason for the case $M(\gamma) = 0$, $\xi_\gamma(u)$ lies in $\mathcal{Y}$, i.e., the last $(d-n)$ components of $(w_0 + \mathring{w})$ vanish. Meanwhile, ξ_γ does not lie in $\mathcal{Y}$, otherwise we have $\gamma C_u \subset G_0/K_0$ which implies that $\gamma \in \Gamma_0$. As γ_2 varies, u_1 and u_2 can be arbitrarily large. If there exist u_1, u_2 such that γP_1, γP_2 do not lie in $\mathcal{Y}$, then the geodesic $\gamma\gamma_2 C_u$ meets or stays away from G_0/K_0. Both cases indicates that $M(\gamma\gamma_2)N_u(\gamma\gamma_2) \neq 0$ (see the argument for the case $M(\gamma) = 0$). Let $\gamma' = \gamma\gamma_2$, then we are

done. If γP_1 or γP_2 lies in $\mathcal{X}$ for any u_1, u_2, then for any $i \geqslant n$ we have $(w_0 + \mathring{w})_i = 0$ as $r \to 0$, where $\mathring{w}$ depends on u_1 or u_2 (not u). This is equivalent to

$$\frac{\alpha_i - \frac{u_{i+1,1}}{2}}{\frac{1+u_{11}}{2} + \beta} = -w_{0i}, \quad \forall\ i \geqslant n,$$

for any u_1 or u_2 (which correspond to γ_2). Assume that the above identity holds for infinitely many u_1 which can be large enough. Then we get $-w_{0i} = \frac{u_{i+1,1}}{1-u_{11}}$ $(i \geqslant n)$, the proportion of the coefficients of $|u|^2$ of $\alpha_i - \frac{u_{i+1,1}}{2}$ and $\frac{1+u_{11}}{2} + \beta$. The proportion of the constant terms of $\alpha_i - \frac{u_{i+1,1}}{2}$ and $\frac{1+u_{11}}{2} + \beta$ should also be equal to $-w_{0i} = \frac{u_{i+1,1}}{1-u_{11}}$. This yields $\frac{u_{i+1,1}}{1+u_{11}} = -\frac{u_{i+1,1}}{1-u_{11}}$ from which we get $u_{i+1,1} = 0$ $(i \geqslant n)$. It follows that $w_{0i} = 0$ $(i \geqslant n)$ and ξ_γ lies in $\mathcal{Y}$ as $(w_0 + \tilde{w})_i = 0$ for $i \geqslant n$, but we have shown that ξ_γ does not lie in $\mathcal{Y}$.

Now we show the first two properties of Proposition 2. Let $\gamma = a_{r_0} n_{w_0} k(\gamma)$ and write $k(\gamma)\gamma_3 = n_w a_s k \in NAK$ where $\gamma_3 = a_{\ell_0^p} k_0^p \in AM_0$ $(p \in \mathbb{Z})$. Then $\gamma\gamma_3 = a_{r_0 s} n_{(w_0+w)/s} k$ for some $k \in K$. Applying (18) and (19) to $u = 0$, we get the i-th component of $\frac{w_0+w}{s}$:

$$\left(\frac{w_0 + w}{s}\right)_i = \frac{w_{0\,i}(1 - u_{11}) + u_{i+1,\,1}}{2}\,\ell_0^p + \frac{w_{0\,i}(1 + u_{11}) - u_{i+1,\,1}}{2}\,\ell_0^{-p}.$$

Although $M(\gamma)$ is nonzero under our assumption, it is possible that certain m_i $(i \geqslant n)$ might be zero. If $m_i = \frac{w_{0\,i}(1-u_{11})+u_{i+1,\,1}}{2} \neq 0$ and $\frac{w_{0\,i}(1+u_{11})-u_{i+1,\,1}}{2} \neq 0$, then we can choose proper p (i.e., γ_3) such that $\left|\left(\frac{w_0+w}{s}\right)_i\right|$ is large enough. Here we require that $p < 0$ and $|p|$ is large. Replacing γ with $\gamma\gamma_3$, we might as well assume that $|w_{0i}|$ is large enough. If $\frac{w_{0\,i}(1-u_{11})+u_{i+1,\,1}}{2} = \frac{w_{0\,i}(1+u_{11})-u_{i+1,\,1}}{2} = 0$, then $w_{0i} = u_{i+1,1} = 0$. It follows from (25) that $n_i = \sum_{j=2}^{n}(u_{i+1,j} - w_{0i}u_{1j})u_{j-1}$. Thus, $|n_i|$ achieves its minimal value at $u = 0 \in \mathcal{F}$. There is nothing to prove in this case. Next we discuss the case where $m_i = 0$ and $w_{0i} \neq 0$. It follows that $\frac{w_{0\,i}(1+u_{11})-u_{i+1,\,1}}{2} \neq 0$ (otherwise, $w_{0i} = 0$). The above formula shows that $\left|\left(\frac{w_0+w}{s}\right)_i\right|$ can be large enough provided that $p < 0$ and $|p|$ is large. Replacing γ with $\gamma\gamma_3$ we assume that $|w_{0i}|$ is large enough. The case $m_i = 0$ and $w_{0i} = 0$ is equivalent to the case $\frac{w_{0\,i}(1-u_{11})+u_{i+1,\,1}}{2} = \frac{w_{0\,i}(1+u_{11})-u_{i+1,\,1}}{2} = 0$ which has been discussed in above. In all, except the trivial cases (when $w_{0i} = u_{i+1,1} = 0$) we can and will assume that $|w_{0i}|$ is large enough. In view of Proposition 3, this implies that both $|m_i|$ and $M(\gamma)$ are large enough (again, note that $M(\gamma) \neq 0$, i.e., not all m_i are zero). By (25) we can write n_i as $\sum_{j=2}^{n} n'_{i,j-1}$ where

$$n'_{i,j-1} = m_i u_{j-1}^2 + (u_{i+1,j} - w_{0i}u_{1j})u_{j-1} + \frac{w_{0i}(1 + u_{11}) - u_{i+1,1}}{2(n-1)}.$$

Each $n'_{i,j-1}$ is a degree 2 polynomial with leading coefficient being m_i. Consequently, the u at which $N_u(\gamma)$ achieves its minimal value must lie nearby $u_0 = (u_{0i})$ where $u_{0i} = -\frac{u_{i+1,j} - w_{0i}u_{1j}}{2m_i}$. If $|w_{0i}|$ is sufficiently large, then u_{0i} is close to $\frac{u_{1j}}{1-u_{11}}$ which lies in a bounded interval in $\mathbb{R}$ (independent of γ in view of Proposition 3). Likewise, based on (26) we can show that the u at which $2\sum_{i=n}^{d-1} m_i n_i$ achieves its minimal value also lies in a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. We omit the details.

Finally, we show the third property of Proposition 2. Assume that there exist a sequence $\{\gamma_i \in \Gamma \setminus \Gamma_0 \,|\, \widetilde{\gamma}_i \neq \widetilde{\gamma}_j \text{ for } i \neq j\}$ and $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ such that $M(\gamma_i)N_{u_i}(\gamma_i) \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$. It follows from (20) that $\delta_{u_i}(\gamma_i) \to 1$ as $i \to \infty$. Thus, $\delta_{u_{i*}}(\gamma) \to 1$ where u_{i*} denote the point u at which $\delta_u(\gamma)$ achieves its minimal value. Since u_{i*} lies in a fixed compact subset $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, by passing to a subsequence if necessary, we assume that $\{u_{i*}\}$ converges to $u \in \mathcal{F}$. Then $\delta_u(\gamma_i) \to 1$ as $i \to \infty$. This contradicts Corollary 1. □

5 f and k_f

For the trace formula to be valid, f and k_f should fulfill some conditions (see the end of Sect. 2.4). In this section we examine these conditions. Remember that $f(g) = \Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(g{\cdot}o,\, e{\cdot}o)\right)$ for $g \in G$. Hence f is

bi-K-invariant and $f = f_K$ (see Sect. 2.4 for the definition of f_U). Next we show $f \in C_{\mathrm{unif}}(G)$. Let $U \subset G$ be a small enough compact neighborhood of e which is symmetric, i.e., $U^{-1} = U$ (such neighborhood exists: take $U = V \cap V^{-1}$ where V is a small neighborhood of e). For any h_1, $h_2 \in U$, we have

$$\left|\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(h_1 g h_2 \cdot o,\, e\cdot o) - \mathrm{d}_{G/K}(g\cdot o,\, e\cdot o)\right| = \left|\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(g h_2\cdot o,\, h_1^{-1}\cdot o) - \mathrm{d}_{G/K}(g\cdot o,\, e\cdot o)\right| \leqslant 2\,\mathrm{diam}(U)$$

where $\mathrm{diam}(U)$ means the diameter of U (modulo K), i.e., $\mathrm{diam}(U) = \min_{u_1,\, u_2 \in U} \mathrm{d}_{G/K}(u_1\cdot o, u_2\cdot o)$. By the definition of f, one has

$$\frac{f_U(g)}{f(g)} \leqslant e^{2\mu\,\mathrm{diam}(U)}.$$

Hence, f_U is integrable if f is so. The latter can be shown by the following computation

$$\begin{aligned}\int_G f(g)dg &= \int_N\int_A \Phi_\mu\left(\mathrm{d}_{G/K}(na\cdot o,\, e\cdot o)\right) dadn \\ &= 2^d\left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^{d-1} K_{\frac{d-1}{2}}(\mu) < \infty\end{aligned}$$

where the second step is a copy of the computation for $h_f(\lambda_j)$, dropping the term η_{ν_j} thereof (see Sect. 3). As a result, $f \in C_{\mathrm{unif}}(G)$. For the rest of this section we check the locally uniform convergence of k_f. The L^∞-norm of any Laplace eigenfunction ϕ_j on X satisfies the classical Hörmander's bound (see [**Ho**]):

$$\sup_{x\in X} |\phi_j(x)| \leqslant C\,\lambda_j^{(d-1)/4}\|\phi_j\|_{L^2(X)}$$

where λ_j is the Laplace eigenvalue of ϕ_j, C is uniform for all j. In our context, ϕ_j's are orthonormal basis of $L^2(X)$, so we have: $\sup_{x\in X}|\phi_j(x)| \leqslant C\,\lambda_j^{(d-1)/4}$. For the convergence of k_f, it suffices to consider those ϕ_j's with large eigenvalues, i.e., $\nu_j \in i\,\mathbb{R}$. Thus, we write $\nu_j = i\,r_j$ with $r_j \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then $\lambda_j = \left(\frac{d-1}{2}\right)^2 + r_j^2$. Substituting $v = ir_j$, $x = 1$ into the following formula (see 8.432.5 of [**GR**])

$$K_\nu(xz) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\nu+\frac12\right)(2z)^\nu}{x^\nu\Gamma\left(\frac12\right)}\int_0^\infty \frac{\cos xt\,dt}{(t^2+z^2)^{\nu+\frac12}},\quad \mathrm{Re}\left(\nu+\frac12\right) \geqslant 0,\ x>0,\ |\arg z| < \frac{\pi}{2},$$

we get

$$K_{ir_j}(z) = \frac{\Gamma\left(1/2+ir_j\right)}{\Gamma(1/2)}(2z)^{ir_j}\int_0^\infty \frac{\cos t\,dt}{(t^2+z^2)^{1/2+ir_j}},\quad z>0.$$

The integration by parts shows that

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{\cos t\,dt}{(t^2+z^2)^{1/2+ir_j}} = (1+2ir_j)\int_0^\infty \frac{t\,\sin t\,dt}{(t^2+z^2)^{3/2+ir_j}}.$$

The integral on the right hand side of the above equality absolutely converges for $z \in \mathbb{R}\smallsetminus\{0\}$. Thus, $K_{ir_j}(z)$ is uniformly upper bounded by $\left|\Gamma\left(\frac12+ir_j\right)\right| r_j$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}\smallsetminus\{0\}$. By the Stirling formula on Gamma function (where a, $b \in \mathbb{R}$):

$$|\Gamma(a+ib)| = \sqrt{2\pi}\,|b|^{a-1/2}e^{-|b|\,\pi/2}\left[1+\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{|b|}\right)\right],\quad \text{as } |b|\to\infty,$$

we get a bound: $K_{ir_j}(\mu) = \mathcal{O}\left(r_j e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}r_j}\right)$. Combining this bound with Hörmander's bound, we have:

$$K_{ir_j}(\mu)\phi_j(z)\overline{\phi_j(w)} = \mathcal{O}\left(r_j e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}r_j}\left[r_j^{(d-1)/2}\right]^2\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(r_j^d e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}r_j}\right)\quad \text{as}\quad j\to\infty.$$

The spectrum $\{\lambda_j\}$ of the Laplacian is discrete with ∞ as the unique accumulation point and each eigenvalue λ_j occurs with finite multiplicity, so is $\{r_j \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$. Let $N(x)$ be the counting function of Laplace eigenvalues with multiplicities over X:

$$N(x) := \sum_{\phi_j:\, r_j \leqslant x} 1.$$

Weyl's law gives the asymptotic of $N(x)$ for large x (see [**MP**]).

$$N(x) = \frac{\mathrm{vol}(X)}{(4\pi)^{d/2}\Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2}+1\right)} x^d + o\left(x^d\right), \quad \text{as } x \to \infty.$$

Let $A_j = \sqrt{\lambda_j} - r_j$, then $A_j = \mathcal{O}\left(r_j^{-1}\right)$ as $j \to \infty$. With the bound on $K_{ir_j}(\mu)\phi_j(z)\overline{\phi_j(w)}$ obtained in above and the formula $h_f(\lambda_j) = 2^d \left(\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}}\right)^{d-1} K_{\nu_j}(\mu)$, we have:

$$k_f \ll \sum_j r_j^d e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}r_j} < \sum_j \lambda_j^{\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\left(\sqrt{\lambda_j}-A_j\right)} \asymp \sum_j \lambda_j^{\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{\lambda_j}} = \int_0^\infty x^{\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{x}} dN(x).$$

Here $dN(x)$ means the measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$ with mass 1 at $x = r_j$ (multiplicities counted), otherwise 0. Integration by parts shows that

$$\int_0^\infty x^{\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{x}} dN(x) = x^{\frac{d}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{x}} N(x)\Big|_0^\infty - \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{x}} \left(\frac{d}{2} x^{\frac{d}{2}-1} - \frac{\pi}{4} x^{\frac{d-1}{2}}\right) N(x) dx.$$

Applying Weyl's law on $N(x)$ to the right hand side of this identity, we see that the integral on the left hand side converges. Thus, we have shown the absolute and locally uniform convergence of k_f.

Acknowledgement. *The author would like to thank Professor A. Deitmar for introducing him this topic as well as many helpful discussions.*

References

[**CG**] L. Corwin, F. P. Greenleaf, *Representations of nilpotent Lie groups and their applications, Volume 1*, Cambridge University Press, 2004

[**Ch**] P. R. Chernoff, *Essential self-adjointness of powers of generators of hyperbolic equations*, J. Functional Analysis **12** (1973)

[**DE**] A. Deitmar, S. Echterhoff, *Principles of harmonic analysis*, Springer-Verlag, 2008

[**FJ**] J. Franchi, Y. Le Jan, *Hyperbolic dynamics and Brownian motions*, Oxford Science Publications, 2012

[**G**] A. Good, *Local analysis of Selberg's trace formula*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1040, Springer-Verlag, 1983

[**GN**] A. Grigor'yan, M. Noguchi, *The heat kernel on hyperbolic space*, Bull. London Math. Soc., **30** (1998) No. 6

[**GR**] I. S. Gradshteyn, I. M. Ryzhik, *Table of integrals, series, and products*, 7th edition, Elsevier Inc., 2007

[**H**] S. Helgason, *Groups and geometric analysis*, Academic Press, 1984

[**He**] D. Hejhal, *Sur quelques propriétés asymptotiques des périodes hyperboliques et des invariants algébriques d'un sous-groupe discret de $PSL(2,\mathbb{R})$*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **294** (1982), no. 15

[**Ho**] L. Hörmander, *The spectral function of an elliptic operator*, Acta Math. **121** (1968)

[**II**] A. Ichino, T. Ikeda, *On the periods of automorphic forms on special orthogonal groups and the Gross-Prasad conjecture*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **19** (2010)

[**Kn**] A. Knapp, *Representation theory of semisimple groups*, Princeton University Press, 2001

[**MP**] S. Minakshisundaram, A. Pleijel, *Some properties of the eigenfunctions of the Laplace-operator on Riemannian manifolds*, Can. J. Math. **1** (1949)

[**MW**] K. Martin, M. McKee and E. Wambach, *A relative trace formula for a compact Riemann surface*, Int. J. Number Theory **07**, 389 (2011)

[**P**] N. Pitt, *A sum formula for a pair of closed geodesics on a hyperbolic surface*, Duke Math. J., **143** (2008) no. 3

[**Se**] A. Selberg, *Harmonic analysis and discontinuous groups in weakly symmetric Riemannian spaces with applications to Dirichlet series*, J. Indian Math. Soc. (N.S.) **20** (1956)

[**Ts**] M. Tsuzuki, *Spectral square means for period integrals of wave functions on real hyperbolic spaces*, J. Number Theory **129** (2009) no. 10

[**Wa**] T. Watson, *Rankin Triple Products and Quantum Chaos*, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton 2002 `arXiv:0810.0425v3`

[**Ze**] S. Zelditch, *Kuznecov sum formulae and Szegö limit formulae on manifolds*, Comm. Partial Diff. Equations **17** (1992), No. 1-2

[**Zh**] W. Zhang, *Fourier transform and the global Gan-Gross-Prasad conjecture for unitary groups*, (**180**) 2014, no. 3

Author's address: Depart. of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan Univ., Ramat-Gan 52900, Israel
Author's email: `fsu@math.biu.ac.il`